

Also, a bill (H. R. 10888) to authorize the raising of 40,000 colored troops—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ALDRICH: A bill (H. R. 10889) to punish offenses against the elective franchise—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. SKINNER: A bill (H. R. 10902) to provide for the authorization of a regiment of volunteer mounted infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY: A joint resolution (H. Res. 293) tendering the thanks of Congress to Commodore Schley, United States Navy, and the officers and men under his command—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Louisiana, concerning the improvement of Bayou Courtableau, in that State—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 10890) granting a pension to Mrs. Susan Sidenbender, of Medix Run, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUMM: A bill (H. R. 10891) granting a pension to Anna C. Morgan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 10892) to increase the pension of Andrew J. Taylor—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GAINES: A bill (H. R. 10893) to remove the charge of desertion against Robert C. Hoggins and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HANDY: A bill (H. R. 10894) for the correction of the military record of Capt. William H. Fairlamb, late of the Eighty-eighth Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 10895) to correct the military record of Harrison Defibaugh—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 10896) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds to Albert V. Conway, substituted trustee, for certain registered United States bonds redeemed or assigned by the Government upon forged assignments—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARSH: A bill (H. R. 10897) to grant an honorable discharge to Thomas Ward—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 10898) to pension David Miller—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10899) to pension Joseph J. Colomey—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER: A bill (H. R. 10900) to increase the pension of James Cooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10901) for the relief of William H. Dotson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIDSON of Wisconsin: Resolutions of the Wisconsin State Homeopathic Medical Society, in support of Senate bill No. 164, for nondiscrimination in the appointment of surgeons to the Army and Navy of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the dairy boards of trade of Plymouth, Berlin, Reedsville, Chilton, and Fond du Lac, State of Wisconsin, in favor of the bill to make cheese part of army rations—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Resolutions of the Homeopathic Medical Society of the State of Wisconsin, in favor of Senate bill No. 164, to prevent discrimination against homeopathic physicians and surgeons in the military and naval service of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OTJEN: Resolutions of the Wisconsin State Homeopathic Medical Society, favoring the passage of Senate bill No. 164, to prevent unjust discrimination in the appointment of surgeons in the Army and Navy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: Resolutions of Brotherhoods of Locomotive Engineers, Locomotive Firemen, Railroad Trainmen, Orders of Railway Conductors and Railway Telegraphers, in favor of the passage of the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WEAVER: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Troy, Ohio, favoring legislation providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, July 6, 1898.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by Rev. E. L. WATSON, of the city of Washington.

On motion of Mr. WOLCOTT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of yesterday's proceedings was dispensed with.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. FAIRBANKS, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1612) for the relief of the heirs of Henry Leef, deceased, owner of the bark *Mary Teresa*, illegally seized by Alexander H. Tyler, consul of the United States at Bahia, Brazil, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. CHILTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10510) providing for the transfer from the circuit court of appeals for the ninth circuit to the Supreme Court of certain appeals from the district court for Alaska, reported it without amendment.

Mr. HOAR, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2030) for the relief of the administrators of William B. Moses, deceased, and of Lebbeus H. Rogers, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

STEAMER TITANIA.

Mr. FRYE. From the Committee on Commerce I report an original bill, and I am compelled to ask for its present consideration.

The bill (S. 4847) to provide an American register for the steamer *Titania* was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to cause the foreign-built steamer *Titania*, owned by John Rosenfield & Sons, of San Francisco, Cal., citizens of the United States, to be registered as a vessel of the United States: *Provided*, That said steamer shall not hereafter engage in the coastwise trade of the Republic.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELECTRIC-LIGHT WIRES BEYOND THE FIRE LIMITS.

Mr. GALLINGER. From the Committee on the District of Columbia I report a joint resolution, and as it is a matter of public concern to which there can be no objection, I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The joint resolution (S. R. 182) relative to electric lighting wires west of Rock Creek was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to issue permits to existing electric-light companies in the District of Columbia for the extension of existing overhead electric wires outside the fire limits and west of Rock Creek to be used for lighting purposes only.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. HARRIS introduced a bill (S. 4848) granting a pension to Louisiana H. Delahay; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 4849) for the erection of a public building at Alpena, Mich.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 4850) to quiet title to lot 11, block 12, South Brookland, D. C.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. SEWELL introduced a bill (S. 4851) for the relief of Commander Bowman H. McCalla, United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

THANKS TO COMMODORE SCHLEY.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I introduce a joint resolution which I ask may be read at length and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The joint resolution (S. R. 181) tendering the thanks of Congress to Commodore Winfield S. Schley, United States Navy, and to the officers and men of the squadron under his command, was

read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the thanks of Congress and the American people are hereby tendered to Commodore Winfield S. Schley, of the United States naval force operating against the Spanish forces in Cuban waters, for highly distinguished conduct in conflict with the enemy, as displayed by him in the destruction of the Spanish fleet off the harbor of Santiago, Cuba, July 3, 1898.

SEC. 2. That the thanks of Congress and the American people are hereby extended through Commodore Schley to the officers and men under his command for the gallantry and skill exhibited by them on that occasion.

SEC. 3. *Be it further resolved,* That the President of the United States be requested to cause this resolution to be communicated to Commodore Schley, and through him to the officers and men under his command.

Mr. HALE. What course does the Senator propose that the joint resolution shall take?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I ask to have the joint resolution printed and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. HALE. That, of course, I have no objection to. It is at the present time impossible for anyone here or elsewhere to know the exact condition off Santiago. That great credit is due to officers and men for the remarkable victory and the destruction of the Spanish fleet there can be no doubt. The Department undoubtedly have full information that will help to guide Congress in apportioning the honor. I do not think that anyone today, either the Senator from South Dakota or I, or any other Senator, or anyone else, can form any sound opinion as to whom the credit is due primarily in the case. But the committee in conference with the Department will investigate the matter thoroughly.

Mr. PETTIGREW. It seems a little surprising that there should be any doubt upon this subject, and yet the American people have been led to believe that some one else commanded the forces that destroyed the Spanish fleet. I hope we shall be able, and I know we shall soon be able, to remove that impression. All the accounts this morning and yesterday afternoon point conclusively to the fact that the vessels of our Navy that destroyed the Spanish fleet were commanded by Commodore Schley; that with the *Brooklyn* he pursued for 60 miles and fought the most remarkable naval duel perhaps ever fought in the world, and sank a ship far superior to his own.

For the purpose of calling attention to these facts, for the purpose of seeing justice done, and for the purpose of correcting as promptly as possible the misapprehension on the part of the newspapers and in the minds of the American people with regard to this matter, I have introduced the joint resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, in connection with the joint resolution, I have only to say that the dispatch of Commodore Sampson was very unfortunate in not mentioning the fact that Commodore Schley had taken any conspicuous part in the engagement, and it misled the American people. It has created a very unpleasant impression. There is no man who needs an exposé of the exact facts more than Commodore Sampson, because, turning out as it does from all the newspaper accounts this morning, his reputation is very much damaged by the facts that are now before the public; and really he needs an investigation in order to set him right, whatever may be the facts.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the matter will go to the Naval Committee, and that, of course, is the proper reference. I do not think it is a good time now to stimulate any jealousy or hard feeling between gallant officers in the Navy. That Commodore Schley's conduct was most admirable, brave, and gallant there is no question. Admiral Sampson's report to the Department in detail has not been received. I have no doubt that when that report comes, he will, with that justness, calmness, and deliberation that characterize him, give credit to all of the officers and men who are entitled to it. I think the little agitation which is now urged in the public press and elsewhere tending to a feeling between these officers will all disappear. There is credit enough and glory enough to care for everybody.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I am inclined to believe that this matter ought to pass over a few days for careful investigation. I have no doubt myself as to the competency and bravery of both these men. If Admiral Sampson, or Commodore Sampson, as I suppose is his real title, was in the line of duty called away from the scene of action in conference with General Shafter at the time the engagement began, he was at the proper place for him to be, and he would have been blameworthy if he had failed in that respect. It does not follow, therefore, that because he was absent from the scene of action at the time it started he was unnecessarily absent or neglectful of his duty. On the other hand, I understand from the facts, as I gather them from the press, that he was there in the line of his duty.

Mr. HALE. He was. The Senator is quite right.

Mr. ALLEN. If he had been present, if his duty had called him to remain with the fleet at the time, I have no doubt in my own

mind that he would have sustained a gallant part in the battle that was waged with the Spanish ships.

Mr. HALE. He was in consultation with the commanding general about important movements, in concert with each other.

Mr. ALLEN. That is as I understand it.

I have no doubt, Mr. President, as to the competency of both these men. I will state frankly, however, that I have been somewhat prejudiced against Sampson on account of the constant newspaper puffing he has received since the war began. It has been my observation, having passed through one war, that the man who received the newspaper puffing at the start usually failed in the end. I have been deeply impressed with the strong character and sailorlike qualities of Commodore Schley; and the fact that he has not received much attention from the press has been a strong argument in his favor in my mind, and it is yet.

But, Mr. President, it does not follow that one man is entitled to greater credit than the other if both were discharging their duties at the time. Sometimes it is unfortunate that the man who is in chief command is absent at the time a battle began, and it is fortunate for the subordinate commander that he is upon the immediate scene of action. The commander in chief very frequently is absent and is absent in the discharge of his duty at a place where his duty requires him to be. I do not believe that under such circumstances he should be blamed either in official or in private circles.

I do not doubt but that either Sampson or Schley would prove themselves amply competent to destroy the Spanish fleet, as it was destroyed, either being in chief command. Nor do I believe that there was a commander or a lieutenant-commander or a captain, whatever the titles may be, down to the humblest seaman in all that fleet, who could not and would not have performed the work equally well if the duty had devolved on him.

Mr. President, there is a good deal in my nature of the democratic order, not in politics, but in habits of thought and manner. I believe every man in the world is entitled to credit for what he does regardless of his rank and regardless of the person he may be. If we are to name any man in resolutions, we should name every man who performed his part in bringing about the result of July 3. Every sailor, every soldier, who performs his duty in the interest of the Government and who sacrifices for it is entitled to as much credit and as much public notice in the resolutions of Congress and in the press, regardless of his station, as the most exalted. I have no sympathy whatever with the namby-pambyism that was expressed here in Congress a few days ago to the effect that the commissioned officers alone should be named, while the private soldiers and sailors should be unnamed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

FRANKING PRIVILEGES TO SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

On motion of Mr. WOLCOTT, it was

Ordered, That S. 4704, extending franking privileges through the mails to officers and enlisted men in the Army and Navy of the United States, be re-committed to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

INVESTIGATION OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS.

Mr. HOAR submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations be directed to consider and report whether any further security is practicable and necessary for the protection of the United States against fraud and extravagance in contracts, and especially such contracts as are necessary for the prosecution of the existing war, and against the dealing in such contracts by persons not engaged in the business of producing the articles which they supply; and

Whether it be expedient to require each of the Executive Departments, whenever it has entered in behalf of the United States into any contract for an amount of more than \$1,000, to communicate immediately to Congress, if in session, or if not in session, then to make public in some other way to be prescribed, the names of the persons entering into the contract, the character of the contract, whether the same was given upon competition to the lowest bidder, or if not, for what reason any other bid was accepted, and the names of all persons known to the Department who have urged or promoted the acceptance thereof by the Government; and

Whether the parties entering into the contract or interested therein are lawfully and regularly engaged in producing the article or articles by them to be furnished; and if not, what is the lawful occupation of such persons; and whether they have contracts with other persons to furnish the same.

ADDITIONAL CLERK FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS.

Mr. DAVIS submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to continue until the end of this Congress the employment of the additional clerk authorized by the resolution of the Senate of May 9, 1893, and that said clerk be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, at the rate of \$1,440 per annum.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the

bill (S. 4714) to protect the harbor defenses and fortifications constructed or used by the United States from malicious injury, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed with amendments the bill (S. 622) concerning sail vessels of over 700 tons in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 10709) to authorize the city of Saginaw, Mich., to beautify and use as a public park the United States post-office property in said city, under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury; and

A bill (H. R. 10885) making appropriations to pay session employees of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution to print 100,000 copies of public act No. 133, "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," with marginal notes and index, etc.; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

EIGHT-HOUR LAW.

Mr. CANNON. I ask unanimous consent to call up for present consideration House bill 7389.

Mr. DAVIS. What is the title of the bill? Let it be read for information.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah asks for present consideration, by unanimous consent, of the bill (H. R. 7389) limiting the hours of daily services of laborers, workmen, and mechanics employed upon the public works of or work done for the United States or any Territory or the District of Columbia.

Mr. DAVIS. I feel compelled to object to that request.

Mr. CANNON. Then I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is the morning business closed? The morning business appears to be closed. The Senator from Utah moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7389.

Mr. HOAR. I ask leave to make one observation. If there be anything to displace or take the place which has been occupied so far by the Hawaiian resolution, which I do not expect—but if there be a purpose on the part of the Senate to proceed to the consideration of any other business, I desire an opportunity to test the sense of the Senate in regard to proceeding to consider the bill providing for voting by volunteer soldiers, a matter growing out of the exigencies of the war. It seems to me that measure ought to take precedence of the measure which is now suggested. I do not make a motion to proceed to its consideration, and I shall not make it under present circumstances; but I say if this measure is to be considered I should think that ought to be considered first.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, both the bills which are named, the one advocated by the Senator from Utah and that to which the Senator from Massachusetts refers, are very important measures, and very meritorious no doubt. But it is perfectly manifest that if the motion of the Senator from Utah prevails it will bring up in competition with it the bill referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts, and the effect would be the displacement for a time, indefinite perhaps, of that which by common consent for days has been proceeded with as the preferred business of the Senate. I move to amend the motion of the Senator from Utah by moving that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution (H. Res. 259) to provide for annexing the Hawaiian Islands to the United States.

Mr. CANNON. I make the point that my motion is not subject to amendment.

Mr. DAVIS. I am informed that the motion to amend is not in order, and I withdraw it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. CANNON. I desire to say that there is no wish on my part to displace the joint resolution for the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands. I think that I am one among many Senators here who have given attention to this subject, who have been devoted to it, who have been willing to set aside every other business in order that it might have constancy of attention. But I submit that it is unfair to other pending legislation that this measure, which has consumed so many hours and days, shall also consume the hour devoted to morning business. I would not have attempted to bring up the bill under other circumstances, but I think the debate on the Hawaiian question has reached a point when the patience of Senators who have waited here in attendance upon the action of the Senate on the Hawaiian question could well be rewarded by permitting them to bring up other subjects of paramount importance. I therefore insist on my motion.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I know the motion is not debatable, but I ask leave to say a single word. This bill was reported only on the 30th of June from the Committee on Education and Labor. It was reported without recommendation, signifying at

least that there was a division in the committee as to the advisability of the proposed legislation. It is a bill which can not pass without considerable discussion. If the Senate desires to lay aside in the morning hour the Hawaiian business and proceed to the consideration of this bill, so be it; but it will certainly excite a good deal of discussion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. CANNON], that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7389) limiting the hours of daily services of laborers, workmen, and mechanics employed upon the public works of or work done for the United States, or any Territory, or the District of Columbia.

Mr. CANNON. On that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GALLINGER (when Mr. CHANDLER's name was called). I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. CHANDLER] is at his home in ill health, and that accounts for his absence from the Senate Chamber.

Mr. CLAY (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I do not see him present, and therefore I can not vote.

Mr. GEAR (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. McBRIDE (when his name was called). I have a general pair on political questions with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY]. I have an understanding with him, however, relating to my vote on all questions affecting the consideration of the joint resolution for the annexation of Hawaii, and considering the pending motion as antagonistic to the consideration of the Hawaiian resolution, I feel at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. MORRILL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] on the Hawaiian question. Thinking we might vote differently on this question, I will withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. PERKINS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. ROACH]. He is absent and I withhold my vote. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. PROCTOR (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY], and therefore withhold my vote. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. WETMORE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut (to Mr. WETMORE). Transfer your pair to your colleague.

Mr. WETMORE. I will transfer my pair to my colleague [Mr. ALDRICH], and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DANIEL (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH]. I voted inadvertently, assuming that he was here. I beg leave to withdraw my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS], who is not present in the Chamber. I would suggest to the Senator from Virginia that we transfer our pairs, so that both of us may vote.

Mr. DANIEL. That is entirely agreeable.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. DANIEL. And I mine, Mr. President. I voted "yea."

Mr. BUTLER (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLINGTON]. I suggest to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] that we transfer our pairs. He is paired, I understand, with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST]. We can then both vote. I have already voted "yea."

Mr. NELSON. Yes; let that transfer be made. I vote "nay."

Mr. CULLOM (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY]. He not being present, I will transfer my pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY]. I have already voted.

Mr. CLAY. I am paired with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GEAR] is paired with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. We transfer our pairs. I vote "yea."

Mr. GEAR. On the statement made by the Senator from Georgia, which is perfectly satisfactory, I vote "nay."

Mr. MORRILL. I will transfer my pair with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], and vote "nay."

Mr. BURROWS (after having voted in the negative). I am paired with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CAFFERY],

but I am permitted to vote if my vote is necessary to make a quorum. I am advised that a quorum has not voted, and I will therefore allow my vote to remain.

Mr. WELLINGTON. I vote "nay."

Mr. NELSON (after having voted in the negative). I withdraw my vote and announce my pair with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST].

Mr. TURLEY (after having voted in the affirmative). I voted without observing that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] with whom I am paired is not present. I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. LODGE. I vote "nay."

Mr. ROACH. I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 29; as follows:

YEAS—18.

Allen,
Berry,
Butler,
Cannon,
Clay,

Daniel,
Faulkner,
Harris,
Heitfeld,
McEnery,

McLaurin,
Mitchell,
Pasco,
Pettigrew,
Roach,

Teller,
Turpie,
White.

NAYS—29.

Allison,
Baker,
Burrows,
Carter,
Clark,
Cullom,
Davis,
Deboe,

Elkins,
Fairbanks,
Frye,
Gallinger,
Gear,
Hale,
Hawley,
Hoar,

Lodge,
McBride,
Morgan,
Morrill,
Pettus,
Platt, Conn.,
Pritchard,
Sewell,

Shoup,
Wellington,
Wetmore,
Wilson,
Wolcott.

NOT VOTING—42.

Aldrich,
Bacon,
Bate,
Caffery,
Chandler,
Chilton,
Cockrell,
Foraker,
Gorman,
Gray,
Hanna,

Hansbrough,
Jones, Ark.,
Jones, Nev.,
Kenney,
Kyle,
Lindsay,
McMillan,
Mallory,
Mantle,
Martin,
Mason,

Mills,
Money,
Murphy,
Nelson,
Penrose,
Perkins,
Platt, N. Y.,
Proctor,
Quay,
Rawlins,
Smith,

Spooner,
Stewart,
Sullivan,
Thurston,
Tillman,
Turley,
Turner,
Vest,
Warren.

So Mr. CANNON's motion was not agreed to.

INSPECTION OF SAIL VESSELS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 622) concerning sail vessels of over 700 tons.

Mr. FRYE. I move that the Senate nonconcur in the House amendments and ask for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the Vice-President was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. FRYE, Mr. GALLINGER, and Mr. WHITE were appointed.

PRINTING OF WAR REVENUE ACT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed of public act No. 133, "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," with marginal notes and index prepared by the Clerk, and bound in paper, 100,000 copies, 67,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives and 33,000 copies for the use of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 10885) making appropriations to pay session employees of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 2d instant approved and signed the following acts:

An act (S. 3144) for the relief of Finetta Nalle;

An act (S. 4439) to relieve owners of mining claims who enlist in the military or naval service of the United States for duty in the war with Spain from performing assessment work during such term of service; and

An act (S. 4756) for the relief of Michael McNulty.

The message also announced that the President of the United States had on the 5th instant approved and signed the following acts:

An act (S. 2785) for the relief of Blanche T. Hunton; and

An act (S. 4713) relative to the Corps of Engineers of the Army.

ANNEXATION OF THE HAWAIIAN ISLANDS.

Mr. DAVIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution (H. Res. 259) to provide for annexing the Hawaiian Islands to the United States.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. SEWELL. Will the Senator from Minnesota allow me to call up a bill?

Mr. DAVIS. Let the Hawaiian joint resolution be laid before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota, and the joint resolution is before the Senate.

Mr. DAVIS. I ask the Senator from New Jersey if the bill which he desires to take up is a war measure?

Mr. SEWELL. It is a war measure.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. DAVIS. I yield to the Senator.

ADJUTANT-GENERAL OF THE ARMY.

Mr. SEWELL. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 4831) fixing the rank of the Adjutant-General of the Army.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments, in line 3, before the word "Adjutant-General," to insert "present;" and in the same line, after the word "shall," to strike out "hereafter" and insert "during his term of office."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the bill be read as it will be when amended.

The SECRETARY. As amended the bill will read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the present Adjutant-General of the Army shall during his term of office have the rank, pay, and allowances of a major-general in the Army of the United States.

Mr. SEWELL. Mr. President, I do not think it is necessary to make any remarks on this occasion. The bill is reported with the unanimous recommendation of the Committee on Military Affairs. I think every Senator here knows that without any disparagement to any other officer in the Government service, the present Adjutant-General of the Army has had the hardest worked position that there has been in the service and that he is entitled to the promotion the bill will give him during his term of office. The committee thought they would leave the question open as to his successor, but they are unanimously of the opinion that the bill ought to pass as amended.

Mr. PETTUS. I object to the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is made to the present consideration of the bill. The bill lies over.

STAFF SIGNAL OFFICERS.

Mr. SEWELL. I ask the Senate to take up the resolution (H. Res. 270) to correct an omission relative to signal officers on the staff of corps commanders.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. PETTUS. I ask that the joint resolution be read for information.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that the joint resolution has not come from the Printer.

Mr. SEWELL. It will go over, then.

Mr. DAVIS. I suggest that the consideration of the joint resolution be postponed until later in the day.

Mr. SEWELL. It will have to be postponed if it is not at the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from California [Mr. WHITE] is entitled to the floor on the unfinished business.

POSTAL MATTERS—PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, before proceeding to the consideration of the matter before the Senate, there is an affair which I feel it my duty to call to the attention of the Senate. It will take but an instant.

My attention has been called to Senate Document No. 217, present session, presented by the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW]. It purports to be a statement with reference to the Post-Office, and was presented, no doubt, by way of information and argument. I make the following extract:

This is the issue involved in the proposition of Mr. LOUD to cut down the free-delivery service of the country unless Senators and Representatives will vote for his bill to cut down the service of the Post-Office in the hauling of second-class matter. It is part and parcel of the conspiracy to emasculate the service of the Post-Office and to turn it over to Mr. LOUD's friends, who, he told the Fifty-fourth Congress, could easily make a profit of thirty or forty millions a year out of it.

Mr. LOUD is a Representative of the State of California in the Congress of the United States and has been four times elected by his constituents. He does not belong to the party of which I am a member, but I have long known him personally and am very familiar with his character and reputation. While he is a man of positive convictions and does not hesitate to express himself unequivocally, I have never heard the purity of his motives assailed; and I am here to say that his history, personal and political, demonstrates his honesty of purpose and entire integrity. I

know that the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, in presenting the paper referred to, had no intention of casting any reflection upon Mr. LOUD, but merely desired to contribute certain arguments to a question pending in this body. Any intimation that Mr. LOUD had aught to do with any conspiracy here or elsewhere or has been seeking to or promoting pecuniarily the interests of his friends by his course in Congress is wholly without foundation. I feel it my duty to make these comments because of the manifest injustice and unfairness of the language which I have cited. I trust that the document will not be further circulated with the objectionable language.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I presented the document referred to by the Senator from California. I did not at the time of submitting it notice the objectionable language with regard to Mr. LOUD. I have known Mr. LOUD for many years. I consider him to be a man of the highest character and of strict integrity, and I would not knowingly place any slight upon his reputation or upon his standing as a man.

ANNEXATION OF THE HAWAIIAN ISLANDS.

Mr. DAVIS. I call for the regular order.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. Res. 259) to provide for annexing the Hawaiian Islands to the United States.

[Mr. WHITE resumed and concluded the speech begun by him on the 21st of June. See Appendix.]

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, I shall prove to the Senate that the Government which now exists in Hawaii, with which we are treating for a title to that country, is a Government existing without the consent of the people of those islands, set up by the armed forces of the United States, maintained by the presence of our battle ships from the day of its existence to the present time. I shall show that this Government was brought into being because of the passage of the McKinley law, which repealed the duty on sugar; that the effort to annex the islands resulted from the fact that we repealed the duty upon sugar and placed a bounty upon domestic sugar.

Therefore the Hawaiian planters desired to be admitted into the Union in order to secure the bounty; that our minister, Stevens, going to a friendly Government, began conniving, plotting, and planning to overthrow and destroy the Government to which he was sent the very day of his arrival; that through his efforts, without any armed force on the part of those people, without a gun or an armed man on their part, backed by the cannon and the armed marines of this Government, thirteen men were made the rulers of that country, and even then, when our marines returned to their vessel, President Dole, as he called himself and as the thirteen called him, sent a letter to our minister, saying, "We can not maintain this Government which you have set up; we have not the power to perpetuate its existence," and asking to have the flag of the United States raised over their building; and it was raised, and remained there for two months, until they were able to gather together and confiscate all the arms upon the islands, to import foreign mercenaries whom they armed, thus collecting an armed force of 400 men.

Every revolution which has occurred in Hawaii has occurred in the town of Honolulu, the capital of the islands, the largest center of population. Every disturbance has occurred there. Every time there has been an overthrow of the Government or riot or dispute it has occurred within that city. All the rest of the islands have always had peace. There was never any disturbance, there was no danger to life or property, and no pretense of danger to life or property. This revolution occurred in Honolulu, and yet peace reigned in all the other towns, and I will show that these same conspirators were the cause of all the trouble and all the difficulty which has heretofore existed.

George W. Merrill, who was our minister to Hawaii, wrote Mr. Secretary Blaine, September 7, 1889, as follows:

It is also noticeable that among the American residents here there are several who, from personal motives, contemplate with satisfaction periodical disquietude in this Kingdom, hoping that frequent revolutionary epochs will force the United States Government to make this group a part of its territory and to absorb into its body politic this heterogeneous population of 80,000, consisting of Chinese, Japanese, Portuguese, native Hawaiians, half-castes, and only about 5,000 of those who may be properly denominated the white race.

In order to keep affairs in as much turmoil as possible baseless rumors are constantly put in circulation, many of which find publication in other countries.

I have, etc.,

GEORGE W. MERRILL.

This was our minister. It is an official document found in the archives of the State Department, written on the 7th of September, 1889.

He was superseded shortly afterwards by Mr. Stevens. Mr. Stevens was appointed minister in October, 1889. Harrison had been elected President. One of the issues of the campaign was

free sugar. The McKinley Act became a law August 27, 1890. On August 20, 1891, Mr. Stevens writes to Mr. Blaine as follows:

The probabilities strongly favor the presumption that a United States war ship will not be pressing necessary in the two or three immediate months.

But as early as the 1st of December, without fail, the month preceding the election, and for some time thereafter, there should be a United States vessel here to render things secure. I have strong reluctance to being regarded an alarmist, but with due regard to my responsibility I am impelled to express the opinion that a proper regard for American interests will require one ship here most of the time in 1892. There are increasing indications that the annexation sentiment is growing among the business men. The present political situation is feverish, and I see no prospect of its being permanently otherwise until these islands become a part of the American Union or a possession of Great Britain.

The intelligent and responsible men here, unaided by outside support, are too few in numbers to control in political affairs and secure good government. There are indications that the liberals are about to declare for annexation. At a future time I shall deem it my official duty to give a more elaborate statement of facts and reasons why a "new departure" by the United States as to Hawaii is rapidly becoming a necessity, that a "protectorate" is impracticable, and that annexation must be the future remedy, or else Great Britain will be furnished with circumstances and opportunity to get a hold on these islands, which will cause future serious embarrassment to the United States.

At this time there seems to be no immediate prospect of its being safe to have the harbor of Honolulu left without an American vessel of war. Last week a British gunboat arrived here, and it is said will remain here for an indefinite period.

I am, etc.,

JOHN L. STEVENS.

Here, then, is our minister, accredited to a friendly Government, contemplating the destruction of that Government and the annexation of the territory. There was no negotiation.

Further on, in his next dispatch, he asked the State Department to keep secret his plot, to keep secret his statement in regard to the overthrow of that Government; and he says in the dispatch that it would be uncomfortable for him if the facts were known in Hawaii. Here was a minister to a friendly Government planning its overthrow, evidently planning with its enemies to cause its overthrow and annex it to this country, carrying on a correspondence which he did not dare to have disclosed because of the treasonable conduct in which he was engaged.

On November 20, 1892, Stevens again writes:

THE EXISTING BUSINESS STATUS.

It is well to consider the existing state of things here resulting from the change in the United States sugar tariff. Only personal observation and a careful investigation of the facts can give one an adequate idea of the severe blow sugar raising here has received. The production of sugar being the main business of the islands, the great reduction of the market price has affected powerfully the entire affairs and condition of the islands. I think it understating the truth to express the opinion that the loss to the owners of the sugar plantations and mills, etc., and the consequent depreciation of other property by the passage of the McKinley bill, wise and beneficial as that measure is proving to be for the vast interests of the United States, has not been less than \$12,000,000, a large portion of this loss falling on Americans residing here and in California.

Unless some positive measures of relief be granted, the depreciation of sugar property here will continue to go on. Wise, bold action by the United States will rescue the property holders from great losses, give the islands a government which will put an end to a worse than useless expenditure of a large proportion of the revenues of the country, using them for the building of roads and bridges, thus helping to develop the natural resources of the islands, aiding to diversify the industries and to increase the number of the responsible citizens.

WHAT SHOULD BE DONE?

One of two courses seems to me absolutely necessary to be followed, either bold and vigorous measures for annexation or a "customs union," an ocean cable from the Californian coast to Honolulu, Pearl Harbor perpetually ceded to the United States, with an implied but not necessarily stipulated American protectorate over the islands. I believe the former to be the better, that which will prove much the more advantageous to the islands, and the cheapest and least embarrassing in the end for the United States.

Here, then, Mr. President, in 1892, two months before the final revolution, our minister outlines the reason for it—that the sugar interests of the islands are declining because we took the tariff off of sugar, because they can no longer get out of the pockets of the people of the United States, by remitting duties, 2 cents a pound.

But there is other evidence, Mr. President, which shows conclusively that this revolution was brought about purely and simply by the sugar planters in the interest of the sugar raisers. On the 8th of March, 1892, our minister, Mr. Stevens, writes the following letter:

Mr. Stevens to Mr. Blaine.

HONOLULU, March 8, 1892.

SIR: In view of possible contingencies in these islands I ask for the instructions of the Department of State on the following, viz:

If the Government here should be surprised and overturned by an orderly and peaceful revolutionary movement, largely of native Hawaiians, and a provisional or republican government organized and proclaimed, would the United States minister and naval commander here be justified in responding affirmatively to the call of the members of the removed Government to restore them to power or replace them in possession of the Government buildings?

Or should the United States minister and naval commander confine themselves exclusively to the preservation of American property, the protection of American citizens, and the prevention of anarchy? Should a revolutionary attempt of the character indicated be made, there are strong reasons to presume that it would begin by the seizure of the police station, with its arms and ammunition, and this accomplished, the royal palace and the Government buildings containing the cabinet officers and archives would very soon be captured, the latter buildings being situated about one-third of a mile from the police station.

In such contingencies would it be justifiable to use the United States forces here to restore the Government buildings to the possession of the displaced officials? Ordinarily in like circumstances the rule seems to be to limit the landing and movement of the United States force in foreign waters and dominion exclusively to the protection of the United States legation and of the lives and property of American citizens. But, as the relations of the United States to Hawaii are exceptional, and in former years the United States officials here took somewhat exceptional action in circumstances of disorder, I desire to know how far the present minister and naval commander here may deviate from established international rules and precedents in the contingencies indicated on the first part of this dispatch.

I have information, which I deem reliable, that there is an organized revolutionary party in the islands, composed largely of native Hawaiians and a considerable number of whites and half whites, led chiefly by individuals of the latter two classes.

Here our minister, on the 8th of March, 1892, almost a year before the revolution, is in possession of the whole plan, clearly indicating that he was in a conspiracy with these people to overturn a government.

Again, November 20, 1892, Mr. Stevens writes:

UNITED STATES LEGATION, Honolulu, November 20, 1892.

SIR: Fidelity to the trust imposed on me by the President, the Department of State, and the Senate requires that I should make a careful and full statement of the financial, agricultural, social, and political condition of these islands. An intelligent and impartial examination of the facts can hardly fail to lead to the conclusion that the relations and policy of the United States toward Hawaii will soon demand some change, if not the adoption of decisive measures, with the aim to secure American interests and future supremacy by encouraging Hawaiian development and aiding to promote responsible government in these islands.

I find in the evidence taken by Mr. Blount the following. This is the testimony of Mr. Fred. H. Hayselden, a sugar planter on the Island of Lanai:

Q. What do you think were the causes of the revolution?

A. Simply 2 cents a pound on sugar—to get some treaty or some arrangement with America. They did not see their way clear to get it in the face of the McKinley bill. They thought Harrison would be reelected and the Republican policy would be continued.

Q. But at the time of the revolution Harrison had been defeated?

A. Yes; but this thing was marked up long before that. They wanted to force it upon the Harrison Administration, if they could, before the inauguration of Mr. Cleveland.

I have carefully read the foregoing and pronounce it an accurate report of my interview with Colonel Blount.

I read also the testimony of Samuel Parker:

Mr. BLOUNT. Is it your opinion that this movement would have occurred if there had been no effort to proclaim a new constitution?

Mr. PARKER. I think it would.

Mr. BLOUNT. Why do you think so?

Mr. PARKER. A majority of the capitalists of the town had no confidence in our ministry. I think it would have come about anyway.

Mr. BLOUNT. Come about soon?

Mr. PARKER. It would have come about, because even when this attempt of promulgation of the new constitution was made, we were told that they would support us for what we had done—for holding out against the Queen in requesting us to sign the new constitution. This was said to us at that time—at the time when the Queen was asking us to sign it. During the day they had a meeting of the citizens. I mean such men as Thurston, Hartwell, and leaders of the provisional government. They told us they would back us up. They admired us for our pluck in holding out against the Queen's wish.

Mr. BLOUNT. Would this imply a disposition to take action toward de-thronement?

Mr. PARKER. I think it came from the McKinley bill—the first action was on account of the McKinley bill.

Mr. BLOUNT. What do you mean by action?

Mr. PARKER. They said that unless something is done—closer relations with the United States—we are bankrupt. That was long before the Legislature came in session; when I first went into the cabinet.

Mr. BLOUNT. Who do you mean said this?

Mr. PARKER. A majority of the sugar men; those now at the head of the provisional government—capitalists and planters. They said that something must be done to get closer relations with the United States to hold us up. With sugar down to \$45 and \$50 a ton, something ought to be done. A commercial treaty or something ought to be negotiated with the American people.

Mr. Blount in his report makes the following statement:

The controlling element in the white population is connected with the sugar industry. In its interests the Government here has negotiated treaties from time to time for the purpose of securing contract laborers for terms of years for the plantations, and paid out large sums for their transportation and for building plantation wharves, etc.

These contracts provide for compelling the laborer to work faithfully for fines and damage suits brought by the planters against them, with the right on the part of the planter to deduct the damages and costs of suit out of the laborer's wages.

They also provide for compelling the laborer to remain with the planter during the contract term. They are sanctioned by law and enforced by civil remedies and penal laws. The general belief amongst the planters at the so-called revolution was that, notwithstanding the laws against importing labor into the United States, in the event of their annexation to that Government, these laws would not be made operative in the Hawaiian Islands on account of their peculiar conditions. Their faith in the building of a cable between Honolulu and San Francisco and large expenditures at Pearl Harbor in the event of annexation has also as much to do with the desire for it.

In addition to these was the hope of escape from duties on rice and fruits and receiving the sugar bounty, either by general or special law.

The repeal of the duty on sugar in the McKinley Act was regarded a severe blow to their interests, and the great idea of state-manship has been to do something in the shape of treaties with the United States, reducing their duties on agricultural products of the Hawaiian Islands, out of which profit might be derived. Annexation has for its charm the complete abolition of all duties on their exports to the United States.

The annexationists expect the United States to govern the islands by so abridging the right of suffrage as to place them in control of the whites.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator from South-Dakota yield to me a moment?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I think there ought to be a quorum present to listen to the Senator's speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TURPIE in the chair). It being suggested by the Senator from Nebraska that no quorum of the Senate is present, the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen,	Davis,	Lodge,	Pritchard,
Allison,	Elkins,	McBride,	Roach,
Bacon,	Fairbanks,	McLaurin,	Sewell,
Bate,	Foraker,	Mallory,	Spooner,
Berry,	Frye,	Martin,	Sullivan,
Barrows,	Gallinger,	Mills,	Teller,
Caffery,	Gorman,	Money,	Turley,
Chilton,	Hansbrough,	Morgan,	Warren,
Clark,	Harris,	Morrill,	Wellington,
Clay,	Hawley,	Pasco,	Wetmore,
Cockrell,	Hoar,	Pettigrew,	Wilson.
Cullom,	Jones, Ark.	Pettus,	
Daniel,	Kyle,	Platt, Conn.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty Senators have answered to their names on the roll call. A quorum is present. The Senator from South Dakota will proceed.

Mr. PETTIGREW. So, Mr. President, this revolution was organized by a conspiracy of the American minister in the interest of the sugar planters of Hawaii, which the minister says was the chief industry of the island and the basis of their prosperity.

So the American minister had been secured as an advocate of the overthrow of the friendly Government to whom he was sent; and then what was done by these conspirators, few in number, having vast wealth, fortunes made absolutely out of the people of the United States in the profit upon sugar, which is admitted free of duty, while we charged 2 cents a pound on sugar from every other country? The American minister having been secured, the next step was to find an excuse for overthrowing the existing Government.

On the 14th of January, 1893, being Saturday, the Queen took steps to promulgate a new constitution. Petitions had been received by her signed by two-thirds of all the voters of the island protesting against the constitution of 1887 and asking that a new one be promulgated. The constitution of 1887 deprived a large per cent of her people of the right to vote for members of the Senate or any voice in the Government. This was done by a property qualification which excluded them from the right of suffrage. A few of her own people were permitted to serve in the cabinet. The constitution of 1887 had been forced out of the King, her predecessor, by a threat by these same people to assassinate him and overturn his Government.

Mr. ALLEN. What is the number of voters in the Hawaiian Islands now?

Mr. PETTIGREW. Under the new constitution, twenty-six hundred.

Mr. ALLEN. All are male adults, I suppose.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Of course there are a very large number of male adults who have never taken any steps to be citizens or voters; that is, they are the contract laborers, the slave labor from Japan and China.

Mr. ALLEN. Are they by circumstances disqualified from citizenship?

Mr. PETTIGREW. They are not qualified for citizenship because they have taken no steps to secure it, and do not desire it. There are about 13,000 people who have a right to vote for the members of the lower House of the Legislature if they would take the oath of allegiance to this sugar Government, which provides for annexation to the United States, but they refuse to do it. So there are only 2,600 people who are really voters under that Government.

Mr. ALLEN. A property qualification is required for voting in the Hawaiian Islands?

Mr. PETTIGREW. For voting for senators a very high property qualification is required.

Mr. ALLEN. I ask the Senator if that does not disqualify the vast body of male adults in the island?

Mr. PETTIGREW. Oh, certainly, it disqualifies nearly every one to vote for a senator. There are only a few thus qualified. I think there are not over 1,200 people in the islands who can vote for a senator under the property qualification required. But the Queen, in pursuance of this address, proposed to modify the constitution so that her own people would have something to say about the proposition to modify the property qualification and make the Government more nearly democratic, and bring it closer to the people.

Immediately on the proposition being made to adopt a new constitution, these people, nine of them, had a meeting in Smith's office. He was a lawyer in Honolulu. He is now the attorney-general of the so-called republic. There they began to plan and plot for the overthrow of the Queen. But finding that there was opposition to her movement, the Queen abandoned the idea of

issuing a new constitution and sent forth on Monday, January 16, 1893, the following letter:

BY AUTHORITY.

Her Majesty's ministers desire to express their appreciation for the quiet and order which has prevailed in this community since the events of Saturday, and are authorized to say that the position taken by Her Majesty in regard to the promulgation of a new constitution was under stress of her native subjects.

Authority is given for the assurance that any changes desired in the fundamental law of the land will be sought only by methods provided in the constitution itself.

Her Majesty's ministers request all citizens to accept the assurance of Her Majesty in the same spirit which it is given.

LILIUOKALANI,
SAMUEL PARKER,
Minister of Foreign Affairs.
W. H. CORNWELL,
Minister of Finance.
JOHN F. COLBURN,
Minister of the Interior.
A. P. PETERSON,
Attorney-General.

IOLANI PALACE, January 16, 1893.

On Saturday, the 14th, there was a meeting at W. O. Smith's office, and a committee of safety was organized, composed of thirteen members. I propose now to show what this meeting was called for, and I will show it by reading the testimony of Mr. Bolte. Mr. Bolte was one of the conspirators. In answer to a question by Mr. Blount he said:

The answers which I have given to Mr. Blount's questions, "When was for the first time anything said about deposing or dethroning the Queen?" might lead to misunderstanding in reading this report. I desire, therefore, to hereby declare as follows: Words to the effect that the Queen must be deposed or dethroned were not uttered to my knowledge at any meeting of the committee of safety until Monday evening, January 16, 1893; but at the very first meeting of citizens at W. O. Smith's office, on Saturday, January 14, at about 2 p. m., or even before this meeting had come to order, Paul Neumann informed the arriving people that the Queen was about to promulgate a new constitution.

The answer then given him by Mr. W. C. Wilder, by me, and by others was: That is a very good thing and a splendid opportunity to get rid of the whole old rotten Government concern and now to get annexation to the United States. Paul Neumann thought that that might be going a little too far.

At the second meeting at W. O. Smith's, between 3 and 4 p. m. on Saturday afternoon, January 14, 1893, when the committee of safety was appointed, sentiments of the same nature, that this is a splendid opportunity to get rid of the old régime, and strong demands for annexation, or any kind of stable government under the supervision of the United States, were expressed.

Therefore, even if the words that the Queen must be deposed or dethroned were not spoken, surely the sentiment that this must be done prevailed at or even before the very first meeting, on January 14, 1893.

C. BOLTE.

HONOLULU, June —, 1893.

There was no fear of disorder, no thought that life and property was in danger, only a satisfaction that the excuse for revolution had been offered and the time had come to give a new impetus to the sugar industry.

Mr. Smith states that the committee at his office debated whether they would ask the United States to establish a protectorate. They concluded that as the Queen had an armed force it was best to appoint a committee to see the United States minister and ascertain what he would do, and Thurston was selected as chairman of said committee. Thereupon this committee visited the minister. They had met, passed no resolutions whatever with regard to danger to life and property, but had congratulated each other on the fact that an opportunity had arisen for an excuse to overthrow the government and secure annexation to the United States, purely in the interest of their sugar plantations. Thurston was therefore appointed as chairman of the committee to see the American minister. Smith says:

I went home about dark or a little after, and just had dinner when Mr. Thurston called at my house on his way home, asking me to meet the committee and one or two others at his house at 8 o'clock. I went there and found Mr. Thurston, W. R. Castle, F. W. Wundenberg, A. S. Hartwell, S. B. Dole, and C. L. Carter. Mr. Thurston stated that the committee had waited upon the American minister, and that he had said that the United States troops on board the *Boston* would be ready to land any moment to prevent the destruction of American life and property, and in regard to the matter of establishing a provisional government, they of course would recognize the existing government, whatever it might be.

Mr. Thurston stated to Mr. Stevens the proposition that was under consideration, of establishing a provisional government, and in case those steps were taken, he asked Mr. Stevens what his attitude would be, and Mr. Stevens had told him whatever government was established, and was actually in possession of the Government building, the executive departments, and archives, and in possession of the city, that was a de facto government proclaiming itself as a government, would necessarily have to be recognized. Everything had culminated in a few hours; we were laboring under intense feeling, and it was arranged that different ones of those present should begin drafting papers.

Mr. W. R. Castle undertook to draft something in the nature of a brief historical statement, which would be for a preamble to the declaration. Mr. Thurston was to work upon the matter of the form of the provisional government. Judge Dole quietly stated that he was not prepared to take part in the movement, but that he would assist, at Mr. Thurston's request, in drafting the declaration. I was requested to draft papers to be submitted to the American minister requesting the landing of the troops, in case it became necessary. At a late hour we retired, and the next morning at 9 o'clock the committee of thirteen met at W. R. Castle's residence.

Not one word in all this testimony indicates that these men had any fear of bodily harm or of damage or injury to their property, but it was simply a plan preconcerted to overthrow a friendly

government. They met in Smith's office. They sent a committee to see the American minister and ask him what he would do, and finally they sent to ask him to land troops. After the meeting at Castle's, Smith went to see the American minister and arranged with him as to what should be done if Smith and his coconspirators were arrested. He secured the required assurances and the call for troops was issued. I read further from Mr. Smith's statement:

Before the meeting broke up the form of the request to the American minister in regard to the landing of the troops was adopted and signed by the committee of thirteen, requesting the American minister to land troops, and this request was signed by the committee of thirteen, and decided to be delivered to the minister to be held by him but not to be acted upon until a further request was received from the committee.

Here, then, they had decided to call on the American minister to order the landing of American troops, and then they put the request in his hands to be used by him whenever they notified him they wanted it used. Certainly there was no very imminent danger to the life and property of Americans if he was to delay the landing of troops. Why this delay? To give the conspirators who were in league with our minister a chance to formulate their plans. These conspirators then held a public meeting and Thurston made some lurid remarks, talked about freedom, etc., and about liberty and tyrannical government; and after his lurid speech they passed the tamest sort of resolutions that they protest against the new constitution, but said not a word about overthrowing the Queen or establishing a new government. After this public meeting the conspirators again met in Smith's office in Honolulu, and at that meeting in Smith's office Mr. Smith says:

There was a short and earnest discussion of what was to be done; it was then nearly 4; our plans had not been perfected, papers had not been completed, and, after a hasty discussion, the time being very short, it was decided that it was impossible for us to take the necessary steps, and we should request that the troops be not landed until next morning, the hour in the morning being immaterial, whether it was 9 or 8 or 6 o'clock in the morning, but we must have further time to prevent bloodshed, and Mr. Thurston and I were appointed to proceed at once to the American minister and inform him of our decision. We proceeded at once to Mr. Stevens's house, the United States legation, stated the case to him, and he said that as a precautionary measure, and to protect American life and property, he had ordered the troops to be landed at 5 o'clock, and that they would come. It was then decided to adjourn to meet at the house of Henry Waterhouse at 8 o'clock in the evening. The meeting broke up, and some of us went down to see the troops landed. Thurston gave up—sick. He had to go to bed.

The hour of action had arrived, and the lurid Thurston was sick. Troops were going to be landed. How like conspirators these men acted! They went down to the wharf and mingled with the crowd and asked the troops to land. To protect life and property? No, Mr. President, but for the purpose of overturning a friendly Government, and for no other purpose, were those troops landed. At every step in the proceeding great care was taken to consult the American minister and to know just what he would do in case they were arrested. There was a great sense of fear and apprehension of danger on the part of these thirteen men, only. All honest citizens felt safe and secure in life and property.

The request for troops reads as follows:

The committee of safety to Mr. Stevens.

No. 7.]

HAWAIIAN ISLANDS, Honolulu, January 16, 1893.

SIR: We, the undersigned citizens and residents of Honolulu, respectfully represent that, in view of recent public events in this Kingdom, culminating in the revolutionary acts of Queen Liliuokalani on Saturday last, the public safety is menaced and lives and property are in peril, and we appeal to you and the United States forces at your command for assistance.

The Queen, with the aid of armed force, and accompanied by threats of violence and bloodshed from those with whom she was acting, attempted to proclaim a new constitution and, while prevented for the time from accomplishing her object, declared publicly that she would only defer her action.

This conduct and action was upon an occasion and under circumstances which have created general alarm and terror.

We are unable to protect ourselves without aid, and therefore pray for the protection of the United States forces.

HENRY E. COOPER,
F. W. MCCHESENEY,
W. C. WILDER,
C. BOLTE,
A. BROWN,
WILLIAM O. SMITH,
HENRY WATERHOUSE,
THEO. F. LANSING,
ED. SUHR,
L. A. THURSTON,
JOHN EMMELUTH,
WM. R. CASTLE,
J. A. MCCANDLESS,
Citizens' Committee of Safety.

His Excellency JOHN L. STEVENS,
American Minister Resident.

They were unable to protect themselves. No wonder; without armies, without an armed force, these thirteen men conspiring with the United States minister, proposing to commit treason against their own Government, appealed to the United States to protect them in their treasonable and unlawful act.

If there was great danger, general alarm, and terror among the people of Honolulu, why was a committee sent to Mr. Stevens to delay the landing of the troops until the next day? Why was it, if a reign of terror existed and the lives and property of Americans and others were in danger, that a committee was sent to tell

him that they did not want the troops landed until the next morning? It was because there was no danger to American lives and property, because Honolulu was peaceful, and because the people were about their usual vocations; and the troops were to be landed for the purpose of carrying on a conspiracy, being the only armed forces employed to overthrow a friendly Government.

What excuse could these conspirators make, if there was actual danger to the women and children of Honolulu, for requesting that the troops be not landed until the next morning? The fact of the matter is that they had not their proclamations and other papers ready. Mr. Smith says the mass meeting broke up sooner than they expected, and they were not ready to take the final step just yet; besides, things were getting so hot that Thurston was getting permanently sick, for he entirely disappears from the scene until all danger is over. Thurston undoubtedly is a physical coward.

However, the troops were landed and distributed, not for the purpose of protecting Americans or American property, but to guard the Government building and show the Queen that they were assisting the revolutionists. This was Monday evening. On Tuesday morning the committee of thirteen met again and signed the proclamation, and about 2 o'clock started in two parties on different streets to go to the Government buildings, now guarded by United States troops, to read the proclamation according to this previously arranged plan with our minister. I will read Smith's account of this transaction. He says:

The committee of thirteen signed the proclamation—

They were down in Smith's office, in the heart of the city of Honolulu—

and the executive council then signed the commission of J. H. Soper as commander in chief of the forces, and three copies of the proclamation were completed. The final signing of the papers was completed about twenty minutes past 2, and after a little delay the committee of thirteen, with the executive and advisory councils, started to proceed to the Government building. They had hardly reached the corner of Merchant street before a shot was heard, and it was reported that a policeman had been shot at E. O. Hall & Son's store, and people were seen running from the direction of the Government building toward the spot, and there was considerable commotion. The committee and councils proceeded to the Government building and the proclamation was read. Previous to starting, leaving my office, Mr. Dole requested Mr. A. S. Wilcox to go up to the Government building and come back and report whether there was any armed force at the Government building. He went up and looked through and went through to Queen street, and came back and reported that he did not see any armed men.

These conspirators then met at a law office in the town, and, without a single armed man, proceeded to the Government building, and in front of it, and within 75 yards of the 150 marines landed from the United States vessel, they proceeded to read the proclamation declaring that they were the Government. They, however, took the precaution to go in two parties, one party going up one street and the other party another street, so as not to attract attention. They took the precaution to send Wilcox up to see if there were any armed men likely to interfere, and Damon says that when they arrived they saw that, besides the marines of the United States, there was but one man with a gun, and he asked him if he was not afraid to be alone with a gun assisting the revolution.

If it were true that the necessity for the landing of troops was to protect life and property, why is it that none of the foreign consuls or the representatives of foreign governments have ever been called upon to testify in this regard? There is not one word anywhere which indicates that they had any fear that necessitated the landing of troops. Everything goes to show, and their statements all go to show, they fully understood the conspiracy by which the Government was overthrown, and that the landing of the troops was for the purpose of overturning a friendly government.

I will ask the Secretary to read a letter from Rear-Admiral Skerrett, of the United States Navy, commanding, which will throw considerable light on this subject.

The Secretary read as follows:

Admiral Skerrett to Mr. Blount.

No. 167.] U. S. S. BOSTON, FLAGSHIP OF THE PACIFIC STATION,
Honolulu, Hawaiian Islands, May 20, 1893.

SIR: I have examined with a view of inspection the premises first occupied by the force landed from the U. S. S. Boston, and known as Arion Hall, situated on the west side of the Government building. The position of this location is in the rear of a large brick building known as Music Hall. The street it faces is comparatively a narrow one, the building itself facing the Government building. In my opinion it was unadvisable to locate the troops there, if they were landed for the protection of the United States citizens, being distantly removed from the business portion of the town, and generally far away from the United States legation and consulate-general, as well as being distant from the houses and residences of United States citizens. It will be seen from the accompanying sketch that had the provisional government troops been attacked from the east such attack would have placed them in the line of fire.

Had Music Hall been seized by the Queen's troops, they would have been under their fire, had such been their desire. It is for these reasons that I consider the position occupied as ill selected. Naturally, if they were landed with a view to support the provisional government troops then occupying the Government building, it was a wise choice, as they could enfilade any troops attacking them from the palace grounds in front. There is nothing

further for me to state with reference to this matter, and as has been called by you to my attention—all of which is submitted for your consideration.
Very respectfully,

J. S. SKERRETT,
Rear-Admiral United States Navy,
Commanding United States Naval Force, Pacific Station.
Col. J. H. BLOUNT,
United States Minister Plenipotentiary and
Envoy Extraordinary, Honolulu, Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. BATE. Mr. President, I see but one Senator on the other side of the Chamber, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is suggested by the honorable Senator from Tennessee that there is less than a quorum of Senators present in the Chamber. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen,	Elkins,	McBride,	Sewell,
Baker,	Fairbanks,	Martin,	Shoup,
Bate,	Faulkner,	Mills,	Spooner,
Berry,	Foraker,	Morgan,	Sullivan,
Burrows,	Frye,	Nelson,	Turpie,
Cannon,	Gallinger,	Penrose,	Warren,
Carter,	Gear,	Perkins,	Wellington,
Clark,	Hanna,	Pettigrew,	Wetmore,
Clay,	Hansbrough,	Pettus,	White,
Cockrell,	Harris,	Platt, Conn.	Wolcott.
Cullom,	Hawley,	Pritchard,	
Davis,	Jones, Ark.	Proctor,	
	Lodge,		

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators have answered to their names upon the call. A quorum of the Senate is present. The Senator from South Dakota will proceed.

Mr. PETTIGREW. It will appear from this letter of Admiral Skerrett that these troops were, in his opinion, located for the purpose of guarding the conspirators and helping out the conspiracy. I call the especial attention of the Senate to this fact. Of course I know, Mr. President, that anything I may say upon this subject will not influence the action of this body; that they are going to pass this resolution and annex the Hawaiian Islands; but I propose to make this record, and show conclusively that the United States in doing it is engaged in an act of piracy—it is not conquest. We overturned a friendly government by the force of our arms, and now we treat with the government thus created by us and maintained by us for title to a country without consulting its inhabitants.

The proclamation having been read at the Government building, guarded by United States troops, the United States minister proceeded at once to recognize the new Government. They had not an armed man. They had proceeded to the Government building, where they were clerks and officers of the Hawaiian Government, with not even a policeman present. They stood up in front of that building, within 75 yards of the galling guns of the marines from an American battle ship, and had read a paper declaring that they were the Government. Three-quarters of a mile away the Queen had 500 men under arms; and without waiting an instant, the moment they read the proclamation our minister recognized those thirteen men as the Government of Hawaii, without any armed forces whatever, knowing that he had violated international law and violated the precedents followed by all civilized nations, and he undertook to falsify the facts.

He claimed that he recognized the Government after the Queen had surrendered, after the old Government had given up, after she had abdicated and said she would submit her case to Washington. An investigation of the facts proves that this statement is false. I will show by the official records that the statement was absolutely false and that he recognized that Government the very moment these men read their proclamation. I will not stop to read it, because it is useless, but I will print in the RECORD, if there is no objection, the testimony of Mr. Damon, the present minister of finance of the Hawaiian Government, which shows conclusively that this surrender on the part of the Queen was made after the United States had recognized this so-called Government which we had set up.

The testimony referred to is as follows:

Interview between Mr. Damon and Mr. Blount.

HONOLULU, April 29, 1893.

Mr. BLOUNT. How long have you lived here?

Mr. DAMON. I was born here in 1845. I have been away several times—perhaps to the extent of three or four years in that time.

Q. Where were you on the 17th of January, 1893, at the time the proclamation dethroning the Queen and establishing the provisional government was read?

A. I was at Honolulu. I was one of the members of that body who went up.

Q. The paper was read by Mr. Cooper?

A. By Judge Cooper.

Q. How many of you were there in that body which went up—about?

A. The whole body. There would be four of the executive and fourteen of the advisory.

Q. Please look at this paper and see if they are the persons (Senate Executive Document No. 70, Fifty-second Congress, second session).

A. Thurston was not present, and I do not think Wilhelm was there.

Q. Where did you start from?

A. From W. O. Smith's office on Fort street.

Q. And what street did you take going from there?

A. We walked up directly to the Government house on Merchant street. It was suggested that a part should go by the way of Queen street, but a majority of us went by way of Merchant street.

Q. What was the idea for dividing the committee?

A. So that it should not attract so much attention; and it would be safer, perhaps, to have it divided than going in mass.

Q. Was it because it occurred to them that it might invite attack if they went in mass?

A. That was partly the idea—that it was more prudent. I think we, most of us, walked together—not compactly, but together.

Q. Any crowd following you?

A. No; the crowd was attracted to the corner of Fort and King streets, owing to the shot that was fired by Mr. Good at a policeman. In fact, the crowd cleared from the Government house and was attracted there. From all directions they centered at the corner of Hall's store.

Q. You found, then, scarcely anyone at the Government house when the committee arrived?

A. Scarcely anyone there except porters. After Mr. Cooper began to read the proclamation, then different ones came out of the offices—clerks and officials—while the proclamation was being read.

Q. Some of the provisional government troops, or rather troops raised at the direction of the committee of safety, came on the ground before the reading of the proclamation was finished?

A. When we arrived there was but one man with a rifle on the premises, Mr. Oscar White; but some little time later they commenced to come in from the armory, troops that were under the supervision of Colonel Soper.

Q. Was that before or during the reading of the proclamation?

A. During the reading—toward the end of it.

Q. How many troops came in? Do you have any knowledge of the number you had enlisted?

A. There were enough came in to make us feel more decidedly at ease than before they arrived.

Q. You could not say how many there were?

A. No; they kept coming in right along. They got to be quite a body.

Q. After the reading of the proclamation the late ministers were sent for?

A. After the reading of the proclamation we adjourned to the office of the minister of the interior, and then we commenced to formulate our plans and get ourselves into working order. Mr. Dole was at the head. While we were there in consultation Mr. Cornwell and Mr. Parker came up there from the station house and held a conference with us.

Q. What was the purport of that conference?

A. The result of that conference was that Mr. Bolte and myself were requested to return with Mr. Cornwell and Mr. Parker to the station house and recommend and urge upon the parties in power at the police station to surrender to the provisional government. We had a conference with the ministers in the room occupied generally by the deputy marshal. There were present Messrs. Peterson, Colburn, Parker, Cornwell, Bolte, and later Mr. Neumann, who was asked to come in. After consultation of the matter of their yielding up their power to the provisional government they asked to be let alone for a few moments, and I went into one of the rear cells in the corridor with Marshal Wilson and urged him very strongly to give up any hope or any thought of making any attack, or resistance, more properly.

Q. What reason did you give him?

A. I can not remember at the present moment giving him a reason, but I remember distinctly saying to him: "Now, if you will cooperate with us, if in future I can be of service to you I will do so."

Q. Was there any suggestion of sympathy on the part of the United States minister in your movement?

A. While I was in the station house a man by the name of Bowler said to me: "We are all prepared, but I will never fight against the American flag."

Q. Was there anything in the conversation between you and him in which any intimation direct or indirect that the United States minister was in sympathy with you or the United States troops and officers?

A. I can not remember any definite thing, but from Mr. Bowler's remark they must have thought that the United States troops were here for some purpose.

Q. Was Mr. Bowler with the Queen's party?

A. He was. He was part of the force in the station house.

Q. Did you say anything at all indicating an opinion that there was any sympathy on the part of Mr. Stevens or Captain Wiltse with the movement for the new government?

A. I can not remember. I may possibly have said so.

Q. Did you think so at that time?

A. I may have had an impression, but I know nothing about it.

Q. What was your impression?

A. My impression was, seeing the troops landed here in this time of excitement and turmoil, that—well, I suppose I might say that they could not stand it any longer—the Americans could not stand it any longer.

Q. Your impression, then, was that the American minister and Captain Wiltse and the troops were in sympathy with the movement of the white residents here in the pending controversy between them and the Queen?

A. While we were in the Government building and during the reading of the proclamation, and while we were all extremely nervous as to our personal safety, I asked one of the men with me there, "Will not the American troops support us?" Finally I asked one of the men to go over and ask Lieutenant Swinburne if he was not going to send some one over to protect us. The man returned and said to me, "Captain Wiltse's orders are 'I remain passive.'" That is all I know of what passed between us.

Q. You speak of your impression. That relates to a particular conversation between two or three persons; but what was your impression as to the matter of whether or not the American minister and the American naval officers were in sympathy with the movement?

A. I was perfectly nonplussed by not receiving any support. I could not imagine why we were there without being supported by American troops, prior to the troops coming from the armory. We were not supported in any way.

Q. You had not been in council with the committee of public safety up to that time?

A. No.

Q. Well, the troops were—how far off from the reading of the proclamation?

A. They were over in that yard known as Gilson yard, in the rear of the music hall. They were quartered there.

Q. Any artillery?

A. I think they had a small gun—Gatling gun and howitzer.

Q. Where were they pointed—in what direction?

A. I can not tell you.

Q. You were surprised that they did not come into the grounds while the proclamation was being read. Is that what you mean by not supporting you?

A. I had no definite information what the movement was, as I told you before in a private interview, but knowing that they were on shore I supposed that they would support us, and when they did not support us, and we were there for fifteen or twenty minutes, I was perfectly astonished that we were in that position without any support.

Q. How far would you say, in yards, it was from where the proclamation was being read to where the nearest troops were?

A. I think about 75 yards.

Q. Was there a piece of artillery in the street between the building the troops were stationed in and the Government building?

A. The only piece of firearms of any kind in that street was Oscar White's rifle. We met him as we came around the corner.

Q. Did you have occasion to look there to see?

A. We stopped before turning into the side gate to converse with Oscar White, before proceeding into the Government building.

Q. Are you sure there was not a piece of artillery in that street before the reading of the proclamation?

A. I can not tell you; but the only gun I could see was Oscar White's. I remarked: "Oscar, this is not so very prudent for you to be here with only one rifle in this street."

Q. Where did you see the troops first?

A. I came up from Monolua by a back street and turned into Nuana street, one house above Mr. Stevens's, and as I turned the corner I saw the American troops marching up toward Mr. Stevens's house, and directly in front of his house.

Q. Did you meet Mr. Henry Waterhouse?

A. I met him there at that time.

Q. What conversation passed between you?

A. I think I said: "Henry, what does all this mean?" If I remember rightly now, he said: "It is all up."

Q. And what did you understand by the expression, "It is all up?"

A. I understand from that that the American troops had taken possession of the island. That was my impression.

Q. And was that favorable to the Queen or favorable to the other side, as you understood it?

A. That was distinctly favorable to the foreign element here.

Q. You mean the movement for a provisional government?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you see Mr. Stevens that day?

A. No; I did not see him that day.

Q. What is Mr. Waterhouse doing now?

A. Henry? He is a member of the council.

Q. Was he a member of the committee of public safety?

A. If I remember right, he was.

Q. Is that his signature [exhibiting letter of committee of public safety to Mr. Stevens]?

The letter is as follows:

HAWAIIAN ISLANDS, Honolulu, January 16, 1893.

SIR: We, the undersigned, citizens and residents of Honolulu, respectfully represent that in view of recent public events in this Kingdom, culminating in the revolutionary acts of Queen Liliuokalani on Saturday last, the public safety is menaced, and lives and property are in peril, and we appeal to you and to the United States forces at your command for assistance.

The Queen, with the aid of armed force and accompanied by threats of violence and bloodshed from those with whom she was acting, attempted to proclaim a new constitution, and, while prevented for the time from accomplishing her object, declared publicly that she would only defer her action. This conduct and action was upon an occasion and under circumstances which have created general alarm and terror.

We are unable to protect ourselves without aid, and therefore pray for the protection of the United States forces.

HENRY E. COOPER,
F. W. MCCHESNEY,
W. C. WILDER,
C. BOLTE,
A. BROWN,
WILLIAM O. SMITH,
HENRY WATERHOUSE,
THEO. F. LANSING,
ED. SUHR,
L. A. THURSTON,
JOHN EMMELUTH,
WM. R. CASTLE,
J. A. MCCANDLESS,
Citizens' Committee of Safety.

His Excellency JOHN L. STEVENS,
American Minister Resident.

A. Yes, it is.

Q. Did he seem then pleased or alarmed?

A. He was very much strained and excited. There was no pleasure in it, but still there was a feeling of security. That was it. He evinced a feeling of security. He was not smiling or joking.

Q. It was not a joking time. Well, you say there was nothing in the first visit of yours to the station house to indicate any impression on your part that you believed the United States minister or the United States troops, or both, were in sympathy with the movement of the committee of safety?

A. I was nonplussed. I did suppose they were going to support us.

Q. You did not say anything to the people in the station house to lead them to suppose you were hopeful of aid?

A. I can not remember saying it now; I might have done so.

Q. Did you say it at any place?

A. I do not remember; I may have said it.

Q. Was there an effort on the part of those who were moving for a change of government to make that impression?

A. I think there was.

Q. Was that impression among the whites generally?

A. That I can not say. I know there was that impression. Some of the members tried to convey that impression.

Q. On what occasion?

A. Many occasions. One particular occasion was while we were in the Government building the day the proclamation was read.

Q. What was said, and who said it?

A. Charles Carter said to me, "After you are in possession of the Government building the troops will support you." I think that was his remark.

Q. Was he on the committee of public safety?

A. I think so.

Q. Was he in the party that went up to read the proclamation?

A. He was present there during the time it was read. Whether he went up with us or not I do not remember.

Q. It was during that time he made that remark?

A. Yes.

Q. Was he an active promoter of the movement?

A. I think he was.

Q. Has he any connection with the Government to-day?

A. No; except he is one of the commissioners in Washington.

Q. You have been in previous revolutions here?

A. I have been in the Wilcox revolution. I took quite a prominent part in its suppression. I was one of the ministers at the time.

Q. You had a conversation with Mr. Carter about the time the proclamation was being read?

A. Yes.

Q. You were somewhat anxious as to whether or not you would be supported by United States troops?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you express any fear in the presence of Mr. Carter?

A. Well, no man likes to tell he was afraid.

Q. I do not mean in a cowardly sense.

A. Well, with others, I was convinced that we were in a position of danger.

Q. What did Mr. Carter say?

A. He gave me to understand that we would be protected.

Q. By United States troops?

A. Yes; and when we were not protected by them, I wanted to know the reason why.

Q. Do you mean by that that you expected them to march over?

A. I was under the impression that they would.

Q. What did you accomplish by that first visit to the station house—any agreement?

A. We accomplished this—that it was a virtual giving up.

Q. What was said? What did the ministers say?

A. This is my impression of it to-day: That if they had only to contend with the provisional government and the forces of the provisional government, that they would not give up. That was the impression that I gathered from them; that they felt themselves equal to the occasion so far as the provisional government went.

Q. Then having that sort of feeling, what did they propose to do?

A. They proposed to immediately deliver up. Then they went up, four of them, and had a parley with Mr. Dole and the provisional government. They agreed to desist, but said they must go to the Queen and get her to concur with them.

Q. So far as they were concerned they were willing to yield, provided the Queen was?

A. Yes. Then I went along with them to the palace. We all met in the blue room. There were present the Queen, two young princes, the four ministers, Judge Widdeman, Paul Neumann, J. O. Carter, E. C. McFarland, and myself. We went over between 4 and 5 and remained until 6 discussing the situation.

Q. In that conversation you asked for a surrender of the forces, and the ministers advised it?

A. The different ones spoke, and they all recommended it. Each one spoke. At first Judge Widdeman was opposed to it, but he finally changed his mind on the advice of Mr. Neumann. Mr. Neumann advised yielding. Each one advised it.

Q. Was this advice of Neumann and the cabinet based on the idea that the Queen would have to contend with the United States forces as well as the forces of the provisional government?

A. It was the Queen's idea that she could surrender pending a settlement at Washington, and it was on that condition that she gave up. If I remember right, I spoke to her also. I said she could surrender or abdicate under protest.

Q. And that the protest would be considered at a later period at Washington?

A. At a later period.

Q. Did the cabinet, in recommending her to yield to the provisional government, give her to understand that they supposed that the American minister and the United States troops were in sympathy with the provisional government or with the committee of public safety?

A. I know it was the Queen's idea that Mr. Stevens was in sympathy with this movement.

Q. But I am asking now as to what reasons the ministers gave for her acquiescence.

A. It was their idea that it was useless to carry on—that it would be provocative of bloodshed and trouble if she persisted in this matter longer; that it was wiser for her to abdicate under protest and have a hearing at a later time; that the forces against her were too strong.

Q. Did they indicate the United States forces at all in any way?

A. I do not remember their doing so.

Q. Do you know whether or not at that time they were under the impression that the United States forces were in sympathy with the revolution?

A. Beyond an impression, I know nothing definite.

Q. What was the result of this conference with the Queen? What was agreed on?

A. She signed a document surrendering her rights to the provisional government under protest.

Q. Is this protest on page 22, Executive Document No. 76, Fifty-second Congress, second session?

A. Yes. This was written out by Mr. Neumann and J. O. Carter while we were present. She was reluctant to agree to this, but was advised that the whole subject would come up for final consideration at Washington.

Q. Did you at the time consent to recommend this proposition or not?

A. I was there as a member of the provisional government, but I did not advise as to the wording of it. I did tell her that she would have a perfect right to be heard at a later period.

Q. By the United States Government?

A. Yes.

Q. You yourself, at that time, before consulting with your colleagues, were favorably impressed with that settlement?

A. Well, it was the only settlement that could be brought about. Personally I was satisfied with it.

Q. And you took that back to the provisional government?

A. Yes.

Q. And they rejected it?

A. It was received and indorsed by Mr. Dole.

Q. Now, was there any message sent to the Queen after that?

A. No.

Q. No message declaring that they would not accept it?

A. No.

Q. The surrender was then made on that proposition?

A. Yes; well, then, she sent down word through Mr. Peterson to Mr. Wilson to deliver up the station house. That wound up the whole affair. We immediately took possession of it. It was not delivered up until after this conference.

Q. Now, how long after that was it before the provisional government was recognized?

A. Mr. Stevens sent Cadet Pringle, his aid, and Captain Wiltse sent one of his officers to personally examine the building and report if the provisional government was in actual possession of the Government building. That was done that afternoon.

Q. What time?

A. Between 4 and 5.

Q. What time was the interview with the Queen?

A. After 4, and ended at 6.

Q. You took reply?

A. Mr. Neumann took the reply to Mr. Dole.

Q. Now, when this interview was going on between you, the cabinet ministers, and the Queen, it was known then that the Government had been recognized?

A. That the Queen knew it? I do not think she was told. I do not remember of it being spoken of.

Q. Didn't you know it?

A. I think I knew it.

Q. Didn't these ministers know it then?

A. They may have been present. I can not say. The provisional government were all present when Mr. Stevens recognized it as the de facto government.

Q. What I mean is this: Before you took the message of the Queen back—this protest—the provisional government had been recognized?

A. Yes; that is my impression.

Q. Had that been done at the time you left the Government house to go with the cabinet ministers to talk with the Queen?

A. If my memory serves me right, it had.

Q. Did not the cabinet officers know of it at this time?

A. I can not say.

Q. What do you know about the contents of the constitution she wanted to proclaim?

A. It is too long to write down. I can tell you my connection with it.

Q. Have you seen it?

A. No.

TUESDAY, May 2, 1893.

Q. Mr. Damon, at the time of the writing of the protest of the Queen on the 17th day of January, 1893, signed by herself and ministers, had the provisional government been recognized by the American minister, Mr. Stevens?

A. It is my impression that it had been, but I can not say positively.

Q. Would the conversation you had with the Queen on that day aid you in determining that fact?

A. I do not think it would.

Q. In referring to Mrs. Wilson living with the Queen, in a previous part of this statement, did you mean to say that she stayed with her at night?

A. I meant to say that she was with the Queen a great deal of the time—both day and night.

Q. As a companion?

A. Yes; as a personal friend and companion.

Q. But where do you suppose she slept—at the bungalow or palace?

A. My impression is that her quarters were with her husband in the bungalow.

I have carefully read through the foregoing and pronounce it an accurate report of the two interviews between Mr. Blount and myself.

S. M. DAMON.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will ask to have read by the Secretary a letter from Joseph O. Carter with regard to this transaction. He was at that time one of the Queen's privy council. The letter shows conclusively the conspiracy entered into by our minister and the Hawaiian sugar planters.

The Secretary read as follows:

EBBITT HOUSE, Washington, D. C., February 5, 1893.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Concerning the reasons which led Queen Liliuokalani, of Hawaii, to surrender to the revolutionists of January 17, 1893, I can say of my own knowledge that I was sent for to meet the members of the provisional government on that date, between 5 and 6 o'clock p. m.; that upon entering the room where the revolutionists were and asking why I had been sent for, Mr. Dole or some one standing near him replied that a committee was to wait upon the Queen and notify her that she had been deposed, and that it was thought desirable that I should accompany the committee.

Mr. S. M. Damon, later the vice-president of the provisional government, was appointed to bear the message from the said government to the Queen, and I walked over to the palace with him. The Queen was in the blue room with her ministers and other friends. Mr. Damon delivered the message and assured the Queen that she could note a protest, and that her protest would be sent to Washington for consideration and final action.

Because of Mr. Damon's assurance, Judge Widdeman and I advised the Queen to yield. I should state that Judge Widdeman and I were members of the Queen's privy council. The Queen was not disposed to surrender her throne, but after further consulting with her ministers and other friends she decided to do so, feeling confident that the United States Government would not approve of the action of Minister Stevens and Captain Wiltse, of the U. S. S. Boston.

To influence the Queen Judge Widdeman recalled the action of the British Admiral Thomas, who restored the flag and sovereignty of Hawaii to Kamehameha III, after the outrage committed by Lord George Paulet in 1843; and I assured the Queen that the Government of the United States would, in my opinion, act in the same way. The Queen then signed the following protest:

"I, Liliuokalani, by the grace of God and under the constitution of the Hawaiian Kingdom, Queen, do hereby solemnly protest against any and all acts done against myself and the constitutional Government of the Hawaiian Kingdom by certain persons claiming to have established a provisional government of and for this Kingdom.

"That I yield to the superior force of the United States of America, whose minister plenipotentiary, His Excellency John L. Stevens, has caused United States troops to be landed at Honolulu and declared that he would support the said provisional government.

"Now, to avoid any collision of armed forces and perhaps the loss of life, I do, under this protest and impelled by said force, yield my authority until such time as the Government of the United States shall, upon the facts being presented to it, undo the action of its representatives and reinstate me in the authority which I claim as the constitutional sovereign of the Hawaiian Islands.

"Done at Honolulu this 17th day of January, A. D. 1893.

"LILIUOKALANI, R.

"SAMUEL PARKER,

"Minister of Foreign Affairs.

"WM. H. CORNWELL,

"Minister of Finance.

"JOHN F. COLBURN,

"Minister of the Interior.

"A. P. PETERSON,

"Attorney-General."

To support what I have said about Mr. Damon's action, I refer you to his statement to Mr. Blount, included in the President's message to Congress dated December 18, 1893, which reads as follows:

Q. What was the result of this conference with the Queen? What was agreed on?

A. She signed a document surrendering her rights to the provisional government under protest.

Q. Is this the protest on page 22, Executive Document No. 76, Fifty-second Congress, second session?

A. Yes. This was written out by Mr. Neumann and J. O. Carter while we

were present. She was reluctant to agree to this, but was advised that the whole subject would come up for final consideration at Washington.

Q. Did you at the time consent to recommend this proposition or not?

A. I was there as a member of the provisional government, but I did not advise as to the wording of it. I did tell her that she would have a perfect right to be heard at a later period.

Q. By the United States Government?

A. Yes.

Q. You yourself at that time, before consulting with your colleagues, were favorably impressed with that settlement?

A. Well, it was the only settlement that could be brought about. Personally I was satisfied with it.

Q. And you took that back to the provisional government?

A. Yes.

Q. And they rejected it?

A. It was received and indorsed by Mr. Dole.

Q. Now, was there any message sent to the Queen after that?

A. No.

Q. No message declaring that they would not accept it?

A. No.

Q. The surrender was then made on that proposition?

A. Yes. Well, then she sent down word through Mr. Peterson to Mr. Wilson to deliver up the station house. That wound up the whole affair. We immediately took possession of it. It was not delivered up until after this conference.

I have the honor to remain, very truly, yours,

J. O. CARTER.

HON. R. F. PETTIGREW,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. PETTIGREW. It appears, then, Mr. President, that after the recognition of this so-called government, before the surrender of the Queen or the armed forces which she had, a delegation was sent to her and she surrendered to the armed forces of the United States, saying:

I yield to the superior force of the United States of America, whose minister plenipotentiary, His Excellency John L. Stevens, has caused United States troops to be landed at Honolulu and declared that he would support the said provisional government.

To avoid collision and bloodshed, she submitted the question to the Government at Washington, surrendering to the armed forces of the United States, surrendering after Stevens had recognized this so-called government, surrendering because she was told that the Government of the United States, the Government, those people, she had always been taught to reverence and respect, would do justice and restore her to the throne, and they cited a precedent in Hawaiian history as a justification for this claim:

On the 10th of February, 1843, the British frigate *Carysfort*, commanded by Lord George Paulet, arrived at Honolulu and showed displeasure by withholding the usual salutes.

He proceeded at once to take the King prisoner and make such demands upon him that he surrendered his crown on condition that the question should be submitted to the British Government. This History of the Hawaiian People says:

Under these circumstances, the King resolved to bear it no longer. "I will not die piecemeal," said he: "they may cut off my head at once. Let them take what they please; I will give no more."

Dr. Judd—

He was an American—

advised him to forestall the intended seizure of the islands by a temporary cession to Lord Paulet, pending an appeal to the British Government. The event proved the wisdom of this advice.

On the next day the subject was discussed by the King and his council, and preliminaries were arranged with Lord Paulet for the cession. On the morning of the 25th the King and premier signed a provisional cession of the islands to Lord George Paulet, "subject to the decision of the British Government after the receipt of full information from both parties."

At 8 o'clock p. m., February 25, the King, standing on the ramparts of the fort, read a brief and eloquent address to his people.

Then they submitted the question to Great Britain, and the English Government promptly restored the King to his throne, refusing to accept a usurpation of that sort. So in this case the Queen, having this incident of history referred to, said:

I, Liliuokalani, by the grace of God and under the constitution of the Hawaiian Kingdom, Queen, do hereby solemnly protest against any and all acts done against myself and the constitutional Government of the Hawaiian Kingdom by certain persons claiming to have established a provisional government of and for this Kingdom.

That I yield to the superior force of the United States of America, whose minister plenipotentiary, His Excellency John L. Stevens, has caused United States troops to be landed at Honolulu and declared that he would support the said provisional government.

Now, to avoid any collision of armed forces and perhaps the loss of life, I do, under this protest, and impelled by said force, yield my authority until such time as the Government of the United States shall, upon the facts being presented to it, undo the action of its representatives and reinstate me in the authority which I claim as the constitutional sovereign of the Hawaiian Islands.

Done at Honolulu this 17th day of January, A. D. 1893.

LILIUOKALANI, R.
SAMUEL PARKER,
Minister of Foreign Affairs.
WM. H. CORNWELL,
Minister of Finance.
JNO. F. COLBURN,
Minister of the Interior.
A. P. PETERSON,
Attorney-General.

This woman Liliuokalani is now in this city and has been for months, waiting for this Government to do justice. She has watched the disgraceful drama and been subjected to the sarcasm of the Senator from Massachusetts. She has been slandered and abused, and all this to justify robbing her of the throne and her people of their country.

Are we worse than Great Britain? When Kamehameha in 1843 surrendered and ceded the islands to the British admiral because he could not resist the force of an armed ship of war, the English Government promptly repudiated the act and restored him to the throne; and when Queen Liliuokalani, deprived of her authority by the armed forces of the United States, proposed to submit the question to this Government, she had good reason to suppose that the great Republic would preserve its honor and its dignity among the nations of the world and restore her to her throne. Yet, Mr. President, refusing to examine these facts, Senators propose to ratify this infamy by taking title, against the will of the inhabitants of that country, and to annex it as a part of the United States. This history proceeds:

A proclamation was issued by Admiral Thomas, in which he declared, in the name of his sovereign, that he did not accept of the provisional cession of the Hawaiian Islands, and that "Her Majesty sincerely desires King Kamehameha III to be treated as an independent sovereign, leaving the administration of justice in his own hands."

Then a new treaty was made, and the King was again placed upon the throne. Liliuokalani had reason to suppose that this Government would be as honorable as was Great Britain. For my part, it seems to me that we pay an awful price, independent of all other questions, independent of the sugar duty, independent of the defense of these islands, which must cost vast sums of money; independent of the assumption of debt, independent of the assumption of vast governmental responsibilities—it seems to me we pay a terrible price for this violation of national honor, in establishing a precedent in our history which must be a black page forever, a blot upon our memory as a people; and this is sufficient in itself to make us refuse to annex these islands, at least without submitting the question to a vote of the people of that country.

It is quite important to us to ascertain the date when Mr. Stevens recognized this new government. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, excellent international lawyer that he is, well knew that no precedent could be found for recognizing the revolutionary government until they were in possession and control of the Government, commanding and having charge of its affairs; and if Mr. Stevens recognized the government while the Queen yet had a large armed force and was in possession of all the arms, before the revolutionists had taken possession of anything or performed any of the functions of government, his recognition was a violation of the rights of the Government to which he was sent and ought to be repudiated by this Government. Stevens's own statement with regard to it is sufficient to condemn him, but I will pass that over, as the official record is sufficient. The documents themselves show conclusively that the new government was recognized when it did not exist.

It is important to know whether it was before or after the protest which I have read by the Queen was signed. If it was before, then the United States overthrew the Hawaiian Government. The importance of this question was recognized by our diplomats. Mr. Foster, then Secretary of State, in a letter to President Harrison, said:

At the time the provisional government took possession of the Government buildings no troops or officers of the United States were present or took any part whatever in the proceedings. No public recognition was accorded to the provisional government by the United States minister until after the Queen's abdication and when they were in effective possession of the Government buildings, the archives, the treasury, the barracks, the police station, and all the potential machinery of the Government.

That is absolutely untrue.

No public recognition was accorded to the provisional government by the United States minister until after the Queen's abdication.

We will see whether or not that is true. The record is sufficient, and I will reach it shortly.

The provisional government of the Hawaiian Islands is, by all usual and proper tests, in the sole and supreme possession of power and in control of all the resources of the Hawaiian nation, not only through the Queen's formal submission, but through its possession of all the armed forces, arms and ammunition, public offices, and administration of law, unopposed by any adherents of the late government.

The commission which was sent here to urge annexation, on February 11, 1893, in reply to the Queen's protest, said:

At the time the provisional government took possession of the Government buildings, no American troops or officers were present or took part in such proceedings in any manner whatever.

They were 75 yards in the street, simply commanding the Government building and the place where these conspirators read their proclamation.

No public recognition was accorded the provisional government by the American minister until they were in possession of the Government buildings, the archives, and the treasury, supported by several hundred armed men, and after the abdication by the Queen and the surrender to the provisional government of her forces.

That was signed by Thurston, Wilder, Castle, and Carter. They knew, every one of them, when they signed it, that they were signing their names to an unqualified falsehood. They knew the Queen had not surrendered when the Government was recognized. They knew that she made the protest after their Government, so

called, was recognized, and yet they thought to rush through annexation in the last days of Harrison's Administration, and do it upon that bold falsehood. They stand convicted of willful and intentional lying for the purpose of deceiving the President of the United States and the Senate of the United States. Yet these are the men who are being extolled as models of virtue, integrity, and honesty, and that is the character of the men who overthrew that Government and who now are trying to annex the islands to the United States.

We will go back to the afternoon of January 17, 1893. The conspirators had read their proclamation in front of the Government building, within 75 yards of the line of marines armed with rifles and gatling guns, and they at once sent the following communication to Minister Stevens, which I will read:

HONOLULU, HAWAIIAN ISLANDS, January 17, 1893.

SIR: The undersigned, members of the executive and advisory councils of the provisional government—

I hope Senators have noticed who elected this advisory council—self-constituted. They got together in Smith's office and they called themselves the advisory council of the provisional government—

this day established in Hawaii, hereby state to you that for the reasons set forth in the proclamation this day issued, a copy of which is herewith inclosed for your consideration, the Hawaiian monarchy has been abrogated and a provisional government established in accordance with the said above-mentioned proclamation.

Such provisional government has been proclaimed, is now in possession of the Government departmental buildings, the archives, and the treasury, and is in control of the city. We hereby request that you will, on behalf of the United States of America, recognize it as the existing de facto Government of the Hawaiian Islands, and afford to it the moral support of your Government, and, if necessary, the support of American troops to assist in preserving the public peace.

We have the honor to remain your obedient servants,

SANFORD B. DOLE.	J. A. McCANDLESS.
J. A. KING.	ANDREW BROWN.
P. C. JONES.	JAS. F. MORGAN.
WILLIAM O. SMITH.	HENRY WATERHOUSE.
S. M. DAWSON.	E. D. TENNEY.
JOHN EMMELUTH.	F. J. WILHELM.
F. W. MCCLESNEY.	W. G. ASHLEY.
W. C. WILDER.	C. BOLTE.

His Excellency JOHN L. STEVENS,
United States Minister Resident.

Let us see. Mr. Stevens sent the following reply:

UNITED STATES LEGATION,
Honolulu, Hawaiian Islands, January 17, 1893.

A provisional government having been duly constituted in place of the recent government of Queen Liliuokalani, and said provisional government being in full possession of the Government buildings, the archives, and the treasury, and in full control of the capital of the Hawaiian Islands, I hereby recognize said provisional government as the de facto Government of the Hawaiian Islands.

JOHN L. STEVENS, *Envoy, etc.*

I have read now the notice of this so-called government to the American minister that they had read their proclamation and were in possession of the city and the Government buildings, but there was no statement that they were in possession of the arms, the police station, or the armory, or the armed forces. I have read the reply of the American minister, in which he indicated nothing of the sort. The Queen had not surrendered. Now I will read Dole's letter, dated on the same day.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota what I regard as a very important question at this point. It has been repeatedly asserted, and I have never heard it denied, that the overturning of the native government in the Hawaiian Islands was due to a conspiracy existing among Dole and his followers and certain American interests, and that Stevens was the instrument chosen to assist in that overthrow. I should like to ask the Senator if he finds, or has found, in his reading or in any other way, anything bearing out that conclusion?

Mr. PETTIGREW. That is exactly what I am showing. It is all I have attempted to show to-day, and I have followed step by step this conspiracy by which the Government was overthrown. The Senator has been unfortunate in not listening to me.

Mr. ALLEN. I admit it.

Mr. PETTIGREW. There is not a scintilla of evidence to prove or show anything else but that. Certain American sugar planters, certain sons of missionaries who were residents and citizens of the Hawaiian Islands, conspired together to overthrow that Government, and that they did it solely and alone, with the assistance of the marines of the United States, and that the Queen surrendered to the armed forces of the United States has been proved. Then I showed what took place from the moment they read the proclamation, not having an armed man, and I put Mr. Damon's testimony in the RECORD. Mr. Damon testified that when they had nearly finished reading the proclamation a few armed men appeared, fifteen, I think, and that shortly after they had finished reading sixty appeared. Those were the revolutionary soldiers who were to sustain and support the Government.

The proclamation was read in front of the Government building, within 75 yards of United States marines, and the only armed force in sight were the armed men landed from our own ship in the

harbor of Honolulu. The minute they read the proclamation Stevens recognized the new Government, and then their emissaries came here and told the Senate and told the President that he did not recognize this new Government until the Queen had surrendered her armed forces and abdicated and given up her Government. I say that he recognized that Government as soon as the proclamation was read, before the Queen had surrendered at all, and I will prove it by Dole's own letter. What are the facts?

GOVERNMENT BUILDING, Honolulu, January 17, 1893.

His Excellency JOHN L. STEVENS,
United States Minister Resident.

SIR: I acknowledge receipt of your valued communication of this day, recognizing the Hawaiian provisional government, and express deep appreciation of the same.

Now notice what follows:

We have conferred with the ministers of the late government, and have made demand upon the marshal to surrender the station house. We are not actually yet in possession of the station house; but as night is approaching and our forces may be insufficient to maintain order, we request the immediate support of the United States forces, and would request that the commander of the United States forces take command of our military forces, so that they may act together for the protection of the city.

Respectfully, yours,

SANFORD B. DOLE,
Chairman Executive Council.

I will also read a document signed by the cabinet of the Queen—

Mr. CAFFERY. Before the Senator leaves this part of the subject, I desire to ask him whether there is not evidence in the record that Minister Stevens himself stated the period at which he received the protest of the Queen's Government against the recognition of the Provisional Government?

Mr. PETTIGREW. That is just what I am going to read. The Queen's cabinet, before she surrendered her forces, sent the following communication to Mr. Stevens:

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Honolulu, January 17, 1893.

SIR: Her Hawaiian Majesty's Government, having been informed that certain persons to them unknown have issued proclamation declaring a provisional government to exist in opposition to Her Majesty's Government, and having pretended to depose the Queen, her cabinet and marshal, and that certain treasonable persons at present occupy the Government building in Honolulu with an armed force, and pretending that your excellency, on behalf of the United States of America, has recognized such provisional government. Her Majesty's cabinet asks respectfully, Has your excellency recognized said provisional government? And if not, Her Majesty's Government under the above existing circumstances respectfully requests the assistance of your Government in preserving the peace of the country.

We have the honor to be your excellency's obedient servants,

SAMUEL PARKER,
Minister Foreign Affairs.
WM. H. CORNWELL,
Minister of Finance.
JOHN F. COLBURN,
Minister of the Interior.
A. P. PETERSON,
Attorney-General.

His Excellency JOHN L. STEVENS,
Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, etc.

And yet they say to us that the Queen had surrendered before Stevens recognized this government. I also read Mr. Stevens's reply:

UNITED STATES LEGATION,
Honolulu, January 17, 1893.

About 4 to 5 p. m. of this date—am not certain of the precise time—the note on file from the four ministers of the deposed Queen, inquiring if I had recognized the provisional government, came to my hands while I was lying sick on the couch. Not far from 5 p. m.—I did not think to look at my watch—I addressed a short note to Hon. Samuel Parker, Hon. William H. Cornwell, Hon. John F. Colburn, and Hon. A. P. Peterson, no longer regarding them as ministers, informing them that I had recognized the provisional government.

JOHN L. STEVENS,
United States Minister.

What more conclusive proof can be had? Senators say this record has been answered. It has not been answered. There has never been any answer or defense to this irregular, dishonest, treasonable act, this overthrow of the Government by the American minister and the American marines.

This communication was received at the station house and read by all of the ministers and by a number of other persons.

After this, Mr. Samuel M. Damon, the vice-president of the provisional government, and Mr. Bolte, a member of the advisory council, came to the station house and gave information of the proclamation and asked for the delivery up of the station house, the former urging that the government had been recognized by the American minister, and that any struggle would cause useless bloodshed.

The marshal declared that he was able to cope with the forces of the provisional government and those of the United States successfully, if the latter interfered, and that he would not surrender except by the written order of the Queen.

Then the Queen made her protest, surrendered to the superior force of the United States, and submitted the question to our Government at Washington. Now, I submit, in the face of that undisputed record, we tarnish the honor of this nation if we take title to that country without submitting the question to a vote of the people.

The Queen had when she surrendered about 450 troops, and she was induced to surrender by the fact that an English admiral had overturned the Government of the islands once before, and it had

been submitted to the English Government, and even piratical England had too much honor to take title to a country under such a proceeding. Yet it is proposed that the greatest, freest, grandest Government in the world shall take title to a land against the will of its inhabitants from the puppets we have set up. You can not get away from the record, and you can not answer it. Nobody has tried to answer it in this debate or in secret session, and until you do answer it you indorse dishonor.

On January 31, thirteen days after the revolution, Dole wrote Mr. Stevens that his government could not maintain itself, and asked for the protection of the United States troops. Stevens complied, and our flag was put up over the public buildings, and remained up until April 1, 1893, when Mr. Blount ordered it taken down. If there was a government that had been able to create and establish itself and to maintain itself with an armed force, why is it that thirteen days afterwards they begged of Mr. Stevens, admitting their impotency to maintain their government, to again land the troops of the United States and put the United States flag upon the buildings? That was done on the 31st of January, and it remained there sixty days. The flag went up in dishonor. When it was raised under these circumstances, it was a disgrace to the Republic.

During the sixty days while our flag remained upon this building the provisional government brought in foreign mercenaries, brought in men from San Francisco, collected together an armed force, gathered together every gun upon all the islands, passed the strictest penal laws against the importation of guns, made it a criminal and penal offense to have a gun. When I was in Honolulu last summer, no person could buy a gun in those islands without a license and no man could deal in guns without a license. Every gun was registered. The so-called republic was surrounded by armed men. Back and forth in front of the public buildings and the public offices marched men armed with Winchester rifles. They proceeded rapidly to enact laws, this provisional government, not a legislative body, but nineteen men, self-constituted, supported by our armed forces, for they had added a few more to their number and now had nineteen. They enacted that no one should be eligible to be a senator, or representative, or a juror until he should have taken and subscribed to the following oath or affirmation:

I do solemnly swear (or affirm), in the presence of Almighty God, that I will support the constitution, laws, and Government of the Republic of Hawaii; and will not, either directly or indirectly, encourage or assist in the restoration or establishment of a monarchical form of government in the Hawaiian Islands.

On the 31st an act concerning seditious offenses was published. This law made it an offense to speak, write, or print anything which might bring hatred or contempt against the Government. On the same day was published a law prohibiting the importation of firearms and ammunition without first obtaining the permission of the Government. On the same day an act relating to contempts became law: "Any person who shall publish any false report of the proceedings of said council, or insulting comment upon the same," etc., was liable to imprisonment for thirty days. On the 33rd an order from military headquarters requiring all citizens to report within three days all arms in their possession was published.

The new government found it necessary to keep a strong guard at the Government building, at the palace, the barracks, and the police station. They had pickets stationed in the neighborhood of the Government building.

So they succeeded in getting possession of the arms, preventing the importation of arms, and with the assistance of the United States battle ship, which has remained in that harbor ever since—for the moment one leaves another takes its place—these men have been able to maintain themselves in power, possessing the only guns, the only cannon, and the only means of resistance.

What have they done? They have set up a republic, so we are told. For nearly a year after this government was created they had no constitution. They proceeded themselves—these nineteen men—to enact laws—the most stringent, the most oppressive laws. But after a year they concluded to organize the Republic of Hawaii, and that is the Government with which we are dealing to-day. Such a republic was never known before in the history of the world. They called an election for a constitutional convention, and they provided that the people who would take an oath to support their Government might elect 18 delegates to a constitutional convention, and they constituted themselves members of it without any election—19 of them—making the election of delegates absolutely a farce.

That is the constitution under which they claim the right to cede their country to the United States. At that election, although there were 13,593 registered voters in 1890, 4,477 were registered to vote for the 18 members of the constitutional convention, who were to sit with the 19 members of the existing, self-constituted government and frame a constitution for the Republic of Hawaii. Yes, one-third of the voters, as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] says, voted to elect 18 members to sit with 19 members

of the self-constituted government. Of course it was a farce. Of course the people had no voice in the constitution and no power or chance to say anything about it whatever.

Now, what kind of a constitution did they adopt? It provides for an oligarchy. It provides that the Government shall consist of Mr. Dole as President—he is named in the constitution—who shall hold his office until the year 1900, a Senate of 15 members and a House of Representatives of 15 members, and the Senate and House sitting together shall elect Mr. Dole's successor President after the year 1900, but that no successor can be elected unless he gets a majority of the Senate; and if no successor is elected, Dole continues to hold.

ARTICLE 23.—First President.

Sanford Ballard Dole is hereby declared to be the President of the Republic of Hawaii, to hold office until and including the 31st day of December, 1900, and thereafter until a successor shall have been duly elected and qualified.

ARTICLE 24.—Election of President.

SEC. 1. On the third Wednesday of September, 1900, and on the third Wednesday of September in every sixth year thereafter, the Legislature shall meet to elect a President for a term of six years, to begin with the 1st day of January of the year following.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of such election the Senate and House of Representatives shall sit together.

The election shall be by ballot, and the person receiving a majority vote of all the elective members to which the Legislature is entitled, which majority shall include a majority of all the senators, shall be President for the succeeding term, or for the unexpired portion of such term in case no person shall have been elected prior to the first day of such term.

SEC. 3. If the Legislature shall fail to elect a President before the 1st day of January following the date when the Legislature is required to meet for such election, the President whose term has then expired or the minister who is acting as President shall continue to be or act as President until his successor is elected and qualified; but such failure to elect shall in no case discharge the Legislature from their duty to immediately proceed with such election.

Then they provide that no one can be a senator without the most rigid property qualification, possessing property worth several thousand dollars.

ARTICLE 56.—Qualifications of senators.

In order to be eligible to election as a senator, a person shall—

Be a male citizen of the Republic;
Have attained the age of thirty years;
Be able understandingly to speak, read, and write the English or Hawaiian language;

Have resided in the Hawaiian Islands not less than three years;
Be the owner, in his own right, of property in the Republic of the value of not less than \$3,000 over and above all incumbrances; or have been in the receipt of a money income of not less than \$1,200 during the year immediately preceding the date of the election, for the proof of which he may be required to produce original accounts of the receipt of such income.

And no person can vote for a senator unless he is worth \$3,000 in personal property or \$1,500 of real estate, according to the last assessment for taxation, or has an income of \$600 a year.

ARTICLE 76.—Qualifications of voters for senators.

In order to be eligible to vote for senators a person must possess all the qualifications and be subject to all the conditions required by this constitution of voters for representatives, and, in addition thereto, he shall own and be possessed in his own right of real property in the Republic of the value of not less than \$1,500 over and above all incumbrances, and upon which legal taxes shall have been paid on that valuation for the year next preceding the one in which such person offers to register; or personal property of the value of not less than \$3,000 over and above all incumbrances; or shall have actually received a money income of not less than \$600 during the year next preceding the 1st day of April next preceding the date of each registration; for the proof of which he may be required to produce original accounts of the receipt of such income.

They shut out, then, everybody in the Hawaiian Islands from the right of suffrage except the sugar planters. They made a qualification of voting for senators that would disfranchise 12,000,000 of the voters of the United States. I think many more. I think it would disfranchise 13,000,000 out of our 14,000,000 voters if we had the same provision.

They have a property qualification which leaves no one to vote for senators unless he is engaged in the chief industry of the island which has been built up by remitted duties. See how ingenious it all was. They had a council of state, five of whom were to be selected by the President, five by the Senate, and five by the House of Representatives; and this very constitution provides that a majority of the council can do business. Then it provides that they can sit and make laws and make appropriations when the Legislature is not in session, and that their laws and their acts and their appropriations shall hold good until the last day of the session of the Legislature.

Then we have what? A Senate and a President, who are the Government, and anybody can vote for a member of the House of Representatives who was born in Hawaii, or is a naturalized citizen and has taken an oath to favor annexation to the United States. But the House of Representatives amounts to nothing. It cuts no figure whatsoever, because the Government council, one-third of whom are appointed by the President and one-third by the Senate, can do business when the Legislature is not in session, and the House has no voice in the selection of a President, because nobody can be elected unless he gets 8 votes in the Senate. So the Senate elected by the sugar planters could elect Dole's

successor, or Dole could continue on forever, and the people of Hawaii have no voice in the Government whatever.

They put into the constitution a provision for a union, commercial or political, with the United States. Did that come from the people? They had no voice in it. As I have shown, the constitution was not indorsed by the people or submitted to the people. After this self-constituted convention had adopted that constitution, they declared it the constitution of the Republic of Hawaii, and never submitted it to a vote at all, and it never has been submitted. And yet from this gang of sugar-raising conspirators we propose to take title to those islands. There is no black page on the history of England in the robbery and plunder of the nations of the world as infamous as our own will be if we take title to those islands under these circumstances.

We must submit this question to a vote of the people of those islands if we would escape dishonor. Although there were 13,583 registered voters in 1890, and in 1894 4,477, in 1896, under the Republic of Hawaii, at the first election under this constitution, there were but 3,196 actual voters, and in 1897, under the same Republic, there were but 2,687 voters for representatives. The fact of the matter is that the people have gradually become disgusted with that Government. They have found that they have no voice in it, and they have ceased to take an interest in it. They know it is maintained by the armed force of the United States, and they are uneasy.

If you would submit the question whether those islands should be annexed to the United States to the people of that country—to the 18,000 voters—it is very doubtful if you could get 2,687 votes in favor of it. After a careful investigation of the subject, I do not believe a majority of the white residents of those islands are in favor of annexation. I know that there are none of the natives in favor of it. While we have heard the missionaries eulogized, certainly we can eulogize them but little, unless we can eulogize their work. The natives of Hawaii can read and write the English language. A greater percentage of the people can read and write than in nearly a majority of the American States.

Mr. CAFFERY. Will the Senator from South Dakota allow me to ask him if it is not stated by Mr. Thurston that there is no illiteracy among the Hawaiians; that they can all read and write?

Mr. PETTIGREW. Very nearly. The percentage is very large indeed. I found no native—and I talked with every one I could get a chance to talk to—who was in favor of annexation. At a meeting at Hilo, where 600 natives gathered in a church, I asked those who signed the protest against the annexation of the islands to the United States—the protest which was sent on here and which we have in the archives of the Committee on Foreign Relations, a protest signed by 29,000 of those people—I asked those who had signed that protest themselves to rise to their feet, and every person in that church at once rose to his feet, knowing exactly what they had done.

I talked with officers of the Government who have been given places that these conspirators told me were in favor of annexation. When I reached them alone they would say, "We are holding an official position; we have to say publicly that we are in favor of annexation; but we are not. We love our country and we love our flag; and while we respect and regard the United States with the highest consideration, we are as desirous of maintaining our national existence, as desirous that our flag shall remain in the sky, as you are that the United States shall continue a government and maintain its flag."

I say under these circumstances, Mr. President, owing to the protest which the Queen sent here, owing to the fact that we overthrew the Government by the armed forces of the United States, owing to the fact that the people with whom we are treating for the sovereignty of that country are but our puppets maintained by us, owing to the fact that these facts have never been disputed or denied with any show of proof, the least we can do is to submit this question to a vote of the people of Hawaii.

Will Senators vote to take this title tainted by fraud? Will Senators vote to ratify this robber revolution brought about by us and refuse to consult the people most interested? If they will, it is an astonishing thing. If they will, then you can well suppose that we will go on with our career of conquest regardless of the honor of our flag and the honor of our name. We will go on to acquire other lands. There will be no stopping with this acquisition.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] says that this is wrong; that it is a sin; that it is wicked; but the islands are so little that if we will forgive him for taking that country, he will sin no more; he will be virtuous and resist a like crime if it involves a larger acquisition of territory. But, Mr. President, the first step in wrongdoing is the dangerous step. If we set the example, regardless of honor, of acquiring title to a territory from puppets that we have set up, what will we not do? The Philippines next, with its 7,000,000 Asiatics; Puerto Rico and Cuba must come in, and then the conquest of South America.

Tramp the course that has caused the death of every republic

in the past, and see our flag go down in misery and in shame. The glory of this Republic has been that we have offered an asylum to the oppressed and a hope to mankind which has been followed wherever freedom has burst into bloom throughout the world. Shall we stain that record? Shall we abandon that history? Shall we be one of the robber nations of the world, and have it said of our flag, as Labouchere, in the London Truth, said of the flag of England?—

WHERE IS THE FLAG OF ENGLAND?

Let the winds of the world make answer!

North, south, east, west—

Where'er there is wealth to covet

Or land to be possessed;

Where'er are savage nations

To coddle, coerce, or scare,

You may look for the vaunted emblem—

The flag of England is there.

Aye, it waves o'er the blazing hovel

Whence its African victims fly,

To be shot by explosive bullets

Or wretchedly starve and die,

Or where the beachcomber hammers

The isles of the southern sea,

From the peak of his hellish vessel

The English flag flies free.

The Maori, full of hate, cursed it

With his fleeting, dying breath,

And the Arab hath hissed his curses

As he spat at its folds in death.

The hapless fellah hath feared it

On Tel el Kebir's parched plain,

And the blood of the Zulu hath stained it

With a deep, indelible stain.

It has floated o'er scenes of pillage

And flaunted o'er deeds of shame;

It has waved o'er the fell marauder,

As he ravished with sword and flame;

It has looked on ruthless slaughter

And assassination, dire and grim,

And has heard the shrieks of its victims

Drown even the jingo hymn.

Where is the flag of England?

Seek the land where the natives rot,

And decay and assured extinction

Must soon be the people's lot.

Go to the once fair islands

Where disease and death are rife,

And the greed of a colossal commerce

Now fattens on human life.

Where is the flag of England?

Go sail where rich galleons come

With their shoddy and loaded cotton,

And beer and Bibles and rum.

Seek the land where brute force hath triumphed

And hypocrisy hath its lair,

And your question will thus be answered—

For the flag of England is there.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I take it for granted that no man who may cast his vote for the joint resolution now before the Senate will ever be permitted by the American people to say that he is not in favor of imperialism and a policy of colonial acquisition, for I think it will be well understood in all circles that the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands is the first act in the drama of colonization that is to go on until we have made a portion of our country the Philippine Islands, amounting to 1,400 in number, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and every little dimple in either the Atlantic or Pacific Ocean that may force its head above the surface of the water.

I was very much interested yesterday in the remarks of the venerable Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] when he portrayed the consequences of a colonial policy. I fully agreed with him when he said that he regarded this as the greatest question that has ever been presented to the American people during the existence of this Republic. Slavery, a very important and a very dangerous question, was never fraught with as much danger to the institutions of this country as the proposed policy of colonization.

We have two courses open to us. We have the plain, open, and beaten pathway of a purely domestic policy, in which we have developed from a little over 3,000,000 scattered along the Eastern seaboard to 75,000,000 people extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, a nation whose commerce and whose wealth stagger the world. We can pursue that policy in the future, if we will, with absolute safety; and in doing so we would obey the teachings of the founders of the Republic, for there is not one statesman in all the history of our country, from the time of Washington to the present moment, who has not studiously and sedulously inculcated the thought that national prosperity and national safety are alone to be found in the pursuit of a domestic policy. Under such a policy we can grow to be the greatest nation on earth, and grow in peace and in safety. We can reach the time before many years when this nation can stand defiantly in the face of the combined power of Europe.

But if we are so unwise as to abandon that course and to decline to pursue that policy and enter upon a period or a policy of imperialism we shall be cast upon seas of uncertainty and danger

to the Republic that may, and will, in my judgment, seriously impair our usefulness to our own people if not eventually destroy the Government itself.

Why are we asked to pursue this dangerous course? Not that anything is to be gained to the United States by it, for I have listened patiently hoping and expecting that in the multiplicity of what has been said or would be said in favor of the joint resolution some reason of this kind would be offered for annexation. What is to be gained to the American people by entering upon this dangerous policy of annexation? If the lips of Senators in favor of annexation are not hermetically sealed, I ask any one of them to suggest even the slightest gain to the people of the United States by such a course.

It has been said, it is true, that the Hawaiian Islands are necessary to us for defensive purposes. But, Mr. President, a child capable of locating the Hawaiian Islands on the maps would be convinced at a glance that the statement is untrue. They have no significance whatever and not the slightest value for defensive purposes. They will only add to the burden of our country in defending its coast, as I shall show further along.

We have at this time a main coast line as follows: The Atlantic coast, from Quoddy Head to Cape Florida, 2,043 miles; the Gulf coast, 1,852 miles; the Pacific coast, 1,557 miles; the Alaskan coast, 4,750 miles, or a total coast line of 10,202 miles.

What tremendous sums of money have been spent by the United States in fortifying this coast line! There is not a government in existence to-day, and there never was one in ancient times, possessing the coast line that the United States possesses. We have spent hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars, money wrung from the taxpayers of the country, in preparing adequate coast defenses. And yet it is of daily occurrence that we hear in this Chamber some gentleman suggesting that our coast is not adequately defended and we must appropriate more money for that purpose. A Senator from Washington who was with us a year or so ago secured a favorable report on a bill to appropriate \$100,000,000 of additional money for coast defenses, and, mark you, Mr. President, that was but a step in a system of coast defenses that would eventuate in hundreds of millions to follow.

Yet, Mr. President, we are about to engage in a policy that will increase the coast line of the nation from 10,202 miles to 25,045 miles, for I assume, as I said, that the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands is to be followed by the annexation of the Philippines, Puerto Rico, and Cuba at least; and that any man who advocates or votes for the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands will be estopped from denying the applicability of his reasoning or doctrine to the other islands. So when that is done we shall find that we have a coast line of islands amounting to 13,843 miles, or 3,641 miles more than the coast line of the United States proper.

Will any gentleman, under such circumstances, pretend that it will not cost this Government at least \$170,000,000 to construct adequate coast defenses upon those islands and fortify seventeen different ports to be found in them? That is a low estimate, and that money must come not from the inhabitants of the islands themselves, but from the people of the United States.

Then, Mr. President, what follows? Our standing army must be increased from its present small number to at least 200,000 men to occupy the islands and to keep the natives in subjection. According to accurate estimates, every one of the soldiers will cost the Government a thousand dollars annually. There are \$370,000,000 of additional money to be wrung from the people of this country by taxation.

Then, sir, it is well known that to annex those islands will cause an increase of the Navy. Our Navy under such circumstances will have to be equal in fighting power to the navy of the most powerful nation on earth and its allies. No man can tell how much that will cost. I put it at a minimum when I say it will cost \$100,000,000. There will be \$470,000,000 of money to be wrung from the farmers and the industrial classes of this country without the slightest thing in return to them for this enormous outlay.

Then, Mr. President, come the hundreds of thousands of dollars, or I should say the millions of dollars, we are to expend in arming and equipping this additional navy and these fortifications, and the transportation of soldiers, the cost of repairing the vessels, and all of the millions of incidental charges for the maintenance of such a navy and such an army. And that is not to come to-day alone, but, sir, it is to come next year and the next and the next throughout all the ages or the years this Government may stand.

Is this a light matter, to be treated in silent contempt by the other side, who are urging it along and complaining because some of us see fit to debate it? Are we willing to saddle this tremendous debt and burden on the people of the United States, not now alone, but for all time, without a thorough and a candid analysis before casting our votes? It is a very easy thing when a skillful man desires to seize something as an excuse for his vote to do so; and I regret to say that it is sometimes a very easy thing for a

man to satisfy his conscience and reconcile his preconceived position with consistency and duty. We declared less than two months ago in speaking of one of these islands:

That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island—

Speaking of Cuba—

except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

Do the Islands of Hawaii occupy any different position than does Cuba? Does not the same doctrine apply to the Islands of Hawaii, to the Philippine Islands, to Puerto Rico, and to all the islands of the sea that is here applied to Cuba? We wanted to declare, and did declare, to the world by those resolutions that the policy of the founders of this Republic was to be pursued, and that, recognizing that the people of Cuba were being starved to death by their brothers; recognizing that extreme cruelty and barbarity were being carried on within less than a hundred miles of our shores, it was our duty as a Christian people and an enlightened nation to relieve them; but that the world might not mistake our Christian deeds and our humane acts and be led to believe that we were actuated by greed of power and the desire to acquire additional territory, we not only disclaimed any such desire, but, Mr. President, we said that when the island was pacified we would furl our flag in Cuba and return to this country. Yet the author of that precise language is to-day found in the ranks of the annexationists.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER], who I regret is not now in his seat, a few days ago undertook to draw a distinction between a constitutional treaty and the joint resolution under consideration. He said a treaty was a contract; that statement is correct; that it was an agreement; that is true; that it could be anything else than a contract or an agreement or the assent of parties to it to certain things would be impossible. So there was nothing novel in that statement. He further said that a contract had to be continuing. That statement is not true. It never was the law of contracts and is not to be found in any work on contracts.

A contract, Mr. President, is the meeting of the minds of the parties to it, where they agree upon a specific thing at the same time and in the same sentence, and a private contract must have a consideration and must not be in violation of any statute or of constitutional law or of public morals, but when we speak of the law of contracts, to be found in the form of treaties, the treaty may be tentative, it may be temporary, it may be for a specific time, or its existence may end on the consummation of its purpose and the dissolution of one of the parties to it, and I challenge the distinguished Senator from Ohio, or any of his confères, to find an instance in which a treaty must continue a specific length of time.

All treaties and all contracts must continue until they are consummated or the purpose is accomplished. Otherwise they would be abortive. If a treaty be entered into between the United States and the Hawaiian Islands by which the territory and the sovereignty of the latter should be transferred to the former, that treaty would be binding and would have two parties to it until that sovereignty was ceded and the territory turned over, and then it would be a matter of indifference whether it ceased to exist or not.

But, Mr. President, look at the fault of the logic of the Senator from Ohio. By the resolution the Senate is now considering the same consequences follow. It is declared:

Whereas the Government of the Republic of Hawaii having, in due form, signified its consent, in the manner provided by its constitution, to cede absolutely and without reserve to the United States of America all rights of sovereignty of whatsoever kind in and over the Hawaiian Islands and their dependencies, and also to cede and transfer to the United States the absolute fee and ownership of all public, Government, or Crown lands, public buildings or edifices, ports, harbors, military equipment, and all other public property of every kind and description belonging to the Government of the Hawaiian Islands, together with every right and appurtenance thereunto appertaining: Therefore,

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That said cession is accepted, ratified, and confirmed, and that the said Hawaiian Islands and their dependencies be, and they are hereby, annexed as a part of the territory of the United States and are subject to the sovereign dominion thereof, and that all and singular the property and rights hereinbefore mentioned are vested in the United States of America.

And yet, Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio calls this a continuing contract, and he distinguishes between this language and the ordinary language of a treaty. If by the adoption or ratification of a treaty of annexation, by which the property and sovereignty of the Hawaiian Islands were ceded to the United States, Hawaii would cease to be a government and would pass out of existence, and therefore the objection of the Senator from Ohio that that contract was not continuing would obtain, I ask him, what is the force of this resolution, and especially of the language I have read?

When the Government of the United States takes possession of all the property of all the Islands of Hawaii and assumes sovereignty over those islands and they become annexed, does not the

Government of the Hawaiian Islands pass from existence as completely and as effectually as it would if the islands were annexed by treaty? Yet the Senator from Ohio has offered this shadowy and unsubstantial distinction as a reason why we should adopt this resolution. I do not regard that as very important myself, Mr. President; I simply cite it for the purpose of showing the desperation to which even able men are driven in supporting a poor cause.

I said in my remarks on Monday that I would undertake to prove to the satisfaction of any reasonable man that this whole scheme of annexation and territorial extension is inspired by the sugar trust. I know some of the newspapers are full of statements to the contrary, but any man who looks at the situation as it actually exists, and who remembers that nothing is to be gained by annexation by the Government of the United States, can not reach any other conclusion than that the whole scheme is one of territorial acquisition on the part of the American sugar trust, the tobacco trust, and a few other monopolies, which control not only the markets of the United States in these staples, but the markets of the Hawaiian Islands and the other islands to which I have referred.

Every Senator and Representative in Congress who has heretofore been considered as occupying anything like close or friendly relations with the sugar trust, upon whom that gigantic organization could depend for advocacy and for votes on measures affecting their interests, is found arrayed in solid phalanx in favor of annexation. There is not a single exception—not one—and, Mr. President, where you find the trusted agents of an organization entertaining certain views and pursuing a certain course, you can safely rely upon the fact that they are carrying out the wishes of their retainers.

Has the sugar trust anything to gain by annexation? The Philippines, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Hawaiian Islands produce in round numbers 4,000,000,000 pounds of sugar annually, seven-tenths of which, or 2,800,000,000 pounds, are imported into this country in a raw state and here refined. Bear in mind, Mr. President, that none of these islands has a sugar refinery. There is no refinery in Hawaii, none in the Philippines, none in Puerto Rico, and none in Cuba; but all the sugar produced in those countries, or seven-tenths of the sugar produced in those countries, is brought here by the American sugar trust and here refined in their factories.

The tax on sugar, in round numbers, is about a cent and a half a pound. By its importation under annexation the sugar trust would save a tax of 1½ cents per pound, or \$42,000,000 annually. The value of the use of that money at 4 per cent per annum would be \$1,680,000, making a total of \$43,680,000 annually saved to the trust by annexation. Under those circumstances, why should the sugar trust be opposed to annexation? It is not. It is a new application of the old cry of "Stop thief!" Every one of the agents of the sugar trust, every one of the Hawaiian commercial companies, whose stock is scattered all through this country, is in favor of this scheme of annexation; and do we not all recall that within the last ten days, when what was regarded as a test vote was taken in this Chamber, plantation sugar stocks in Hawaii jumped in value 400 per cent within a few hours? Yet we are told by grave Senators and by great journals, educators of the public mind, that the sugar trust is doing all possible to prevent this patriotic step of annexation.

Mr. President, when you find that organization can make pretty nearly \$44,000,000 annually by annexation, and that all its agents and advocates stand for annexation, is it an illogical conclusion to say that it is in favor of annexation?

What more can it do by annexation? It can spend one-half of the \$44,000,000 a year made by annexation in corrupting the corruptible portion of the public press, in silencing Senators and Representatives, and in molding public opinion in favor of this infamous scheme; and as one I may add, parenthetically, I believe it is none too good to do so.

Mr. President, there are other influences behind this question. The tobacco trust is behind it. All these islands are producers of millions of pounds of tobacco. If the tobacco of these islands can escape taxation, as it will by annexation, it will be a saving of at least fifteen or twenty million dollars annually to the tobacco trust. Their influence is arrayed in favor of annexation. Oh, Mr. President, they do not say they want it because of the pecuniary benefits to them; they know that would appear to the American people to be too mercenary; but they are appealing to the patriotism of the people, their love of power and territorial extension, while they are seeking this tremendous financial advantage for themselves.

Every organization or every institution that is making armor plate is in favor of annexation; every company or individual engaged in the construction of naval vessels is in favor of annexation; all those engaged in furnishing supplies to the Army and Navy, and making tremendous profits out of it, are in favor of annexation; and I have not the slightest doubt that the parties who sold the *Merrimac* to this Government a few weeks ago are in favor of annexation. There was an old vessel that had been repeatedly

inspected and condemned, which originally did not cost over \$100,000, which was sold to this Government for \$343,000, I think, and I have it on pretty good authority that a commission of \$100,000 was paid to secure the sale. I have no doubt these men are in favor of annexation. I have no doubt every pecuniary interest in this country, every selfish and greedy interest that could make a dollar by this scheme, is in favor of it.

But, Mr. President, how should it be with the masses of the people, those who produce the honest wealth of the country and those who do the labor? They should be arrayed against it.

How are these tremendous sums of money I have mentioned to be met? How is the \$500,000,000 of which I have spoken to be raised? We can not impose an income tax because that rests upon the rich, and the Supreme Court has declared that the rich shall not be taxed. I do not know exactly where it draws the line, but the richer a man is the more immunity he has from taxation.

The Supreme Court, overruling one hundred years of its own judicial history and overruling five unanimous decisions of its own, has held within the last two or three years that the rich of the United States shall not be taxed—that the poor alone shall bear the burdens of taxation. We can not, therefore, secure any portion of the money by an income tax; we can not secure forty-odd millions of it by a tax on sugar; we can not secure \$20,000,000 more of it on tobacco; we can not secure any portion of it on rice and other products of these islands, amounting, all told, to probably \$50,000,000 a year; but all that, Mr. President, must be paid by the farmers and laborers and industrial classes of this country.

It may be said the islands will be self-supporting. They never have been. Here is this little, tottering, fraudulent Government now in existence in Hawaii, which came into existence in 1893—I think the conspiracy first appeared in January, 1893—yet it has a national debt of almost \$5,000,000, after having taxed the people and the property of that country to the utmost limit—a million a year. We can not get much revenue out of a government of that kind. We can not get it from the government that will be established in the Philippine Islands, in Cuba, or in Puerto Rico.

We can not under our system of equal taxation—if it is not a sarcasm to speak of equal taxation—take from those people the sums of money they have been paying to the Spanish Government, for the system of taxation imposed upon those people has been onerous, has been fraudulent; it has been spoliation in many cases, and in others absolute confiscation; and yet, with those extreme means of securing money, those governments have not, according to Señor Sagasta, been self-supporting. I do not know but that this would be a good place to call attention to what he says on this subject. Although this man is to-day the premier of a country with which we are at war, a country that from my childhood to the present time I have learned to detest, it can not be doubted that he is a man of intelligence and that he speaks with some degree of truth in giving utterance to the following:

Our colonies have cost us dear. Within the last twenty-five years we have spent in them 3,000,000,000 francs in defensive works. Only the most important cities and points have been fortified, as we could not erect works everywhere. The cost would have been 7,000,000,000 or 8,000,000,000 francs.

So the expenditure, reduced to our money, has been \$600,000,000, and the cost would have been \$1,600,000,000 if all the fortifications had been made. Is it to be supposed, then, that we can procure by lawful means of taxation a sufficient amount of money from the people of those islands to pay the expenses of administering governments there? That can not be done in the light of the facts.

Then, Mr. President, where must the money come from? It must come from every man who produces anything and every man who labors. It must come from the farmers and planters of the United States, the men who toil for day wages and weekly and monthly wages. All this tremendous burden must pass to them without the slightest corresponding benefit. So much, then, for the sugar trust and the tobacco trust and these other interests that are at the bottom of and are inspiring this scheme of annexation.

This is one step, and an important step, in the interest of the perpetuation of a national debt. I have no doubt in my own mind that every man who has the money and desires to own Government bonds and draw interest from the people in the form of taxation is in favor of this scheme of annexation. We have increased our national debt in the last five years from a little over five hundred million to over thirteen hundred million dollars, many million dollars more than half the total bonded debt at the close of the late civil war.

If this money can not be secured immediately by taxation, we will hear the sugar trust and all these interest-eating patriots calling for the issuance of bonds, the borrowing of money; and our bonded debt in a few years, instead of being reduced, will be increased until it will reach \$3,000,000,000, and our people will be in the condition of the English people, meeting interest obligations by the hundreds of millions annually, and never expecting and never hoping to pay the principal. Under such circumstances

there can be but one end. Government will pass from the masses of the people, from the debtor class to the creditor class, and the Republic, if it exists, will exist in name only. It has almost reached that point now. Every one of these men is in favor of annexation.

Mr. President, it is said that the inhabitants of the Philippines number 10,400,000; that they are mostly Malays, with an intermixture of other savage tribes, and that the aboriginal inhabitants are of a repulsive and extremely savage character. I believe out of the 10,400,000 inhabitants not to exceed one-third can be said to be in the slightest degree civilized. Spain has never been able to conquer many millions of those people. Of the people who inhabit the Hawaiian Islands we know more. We know there are not to exceed about ten or twelve thousand of the white races represented there.

The Americans, English, Germans, French, Russians, and all other classes of what may be regarded as belonging to the white race do not number to exceed ten or twelve thousand. The balance of them are Japanese, coolies, pure-blood and mixed Polynesians, a race of people who are afflicted in their entirety as a race with leprosy, one of the islands being set apart and dedicated to the treating of leprosy. Will any man be kind enough to tell the country how we are to be improved by the annexation of that class of people to our country? We often say, and with more truth than poetry, that this country is now gorged with foreign population, that we are receiving them more rapidly than we can assimilate and convert them into American citizens. Yet to carry out the infamous scheme of these monopolies I have mentioned and the interests I have named we propose to annex these islands with 115,000 people, not exceeding 12,000 of whom are white people, and incorporate them into our population.

Mr. President, I come to a proposition of law, and I see present my good friend the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], one of the best lawyers in this body and one of the most conservative men. I wish to make in his presence a statement and see if he will contradict it. When we have incorporated these islands as a part of the United States, the right of the Polynesians to travel from Hawaii to New York, Nebraska, or Connecticut will be as absolute and free from restriction as my right to go to California. I pause for the Senator or any other Senator to deny it. This Government has no power by legislation to restrict me to the inhabitancy of one State. Congress can not pass a law requiring me to spend my life in Nebraska. I am a citizen of the United States and may visit in safety any portion of its territory whenever I see fit; and whenever you incorporate those Japanese and Chinese coolies and Polynesians, with their leprosy, into the inhabitants of the United States, their right to come to your State and to mine and to engage in business there and dwell there and intermarry with the population, if they see fit, is as absolute as the right to life and liberty, and can not be restrained.

Mr. President, what will this country do with 15,000,000 people such as are to be found in the Hawaiian Islands, in the Philippines, in Puerto Rico, and in Cuba, every one of them of an alien race; none of them used to the forms and solemnities of self-government; turbulent, vicious, savage? If they are to be precipitated into the body of our people by this act of legislation, where is the power to restrain them from being brought here or from coming here as competitors of your neighbors and mine? They will swarm the workshops of this country. They will be found on every quarter section of land in this nation. They will debase the price of every bushel and every pound of farm products. They will by deadly competition reduce the wages of the American laboring man, and in the course of ages a civilization akin to their own will be erected in this land of the free. That their influence will be detrimental no one can dispute. Our civilization, instead of taking an upward tendency, as we all desire, until this nation shall occupy the highest conceivable pinnacle of civilization, will go down in consequence of this great weight thrown on it.

Do you not suppose, Mr. President, that there are interests in this country which want to bring about exactly that result? A short time ago a New York capitalist, well known in this country, was reported to have said, "What the United States needs most now is an importation of foreign muscle. We have got enough brains." That man no doubt was speaking by the card. So by the pending scheme of annexation a vast horde of savages, 15,000,000 of them, is to be thrown among our people in deadly competition in all departments of industry and production in the fulfillment of the desire for more muscle and less brain, that the man who has the money can get more labor and more of labor's products for less expenditure, and that all the millions of our people, our native and our naturalized people, may be reduced in their standard of civilization and in their power to produce.

Sir, I am not prepared to put the American father and the American son, in the field or in the shop, in deadly conflict and competition with Chinese, who live upon a bowl of rice and a rat a day; nor am I prepared to vote that the civilization and standard of living of the American mother and the American daughter

shall be brought down to the standard of the civilization of the wife of such a man. Yet that is exactly what this whole iniquitous scheme of annexation means.

The labor question, or the condition of the laboring people, ought to excite some active interest in the minds of Republicans. Ever since I have been old enough to remember anything about tariff theories and tariff legislation I have heard the pros and cons of protection, free trade, and revenue tariff discussed. Those questions have been full of interest to the American people from the formation of the Government to this time. Ever since I have had the honor to occupy a seat in this Chamber I have heard the beauties of protection proclaimed, I think, almost every session of Congress. I remember a particular speech, all of which has not yet appeared in the RECORD, on the subject of the beauty and soundness of protection; and the chief argument in all those discussions was that a tariff was essential to protect the American laboring man.

I will be frank enough to say that I never had much faith in the sincerity of gentlemen who urged such argument. It was made for the purpose of inducing the laboring men in the United States to support that party at the polls, because the laboring men, when united, constitute the majority of the voters of this country. Stripped of all its gauze and everything that is inclined to hide it from observation, that is what it means and that is what it has meant. How do these gentlemen reconcile their position on the question of annexation of the Hawaiian Islands with their deep and constant solicitude for the American laborer to be protected in his wages against the pauper labor of Europe?

Mr. President, we have heard it from the hustings, it has been published in the press, that the ne plus ultra of taxation was the tariff, because it protected the American laboring man against the European pauper laborer and his handiwork, and because it built up in our own country a home market for the consumption of all his products. Yet, in the light of that fact and in the light of the further fact that these gentlemen have deceived the American people on this question, they propose to put into our population, at one stroke of the pen, 15,000,000 pauper laborers. To subserve what interest, sir? Because the demands of humanity call for it? No. Because the interests of the American people demand it? Not at all. Because the interests of our country and our civilization will be strengthened or advanced by it? Not at all. It is simply because the fellows who pay the campaign expenses want it, and the debt must be met and discharged. All the glory of our country is to perish. We are to be cast upon the dangerous sea of competition with Europe for supremacy and to be engulfed in wars, no doubt, not of our own choice or of our own making, to carry out this purpose.

Then, sir, what becomes of that further argument of our friends on the other side that we do not want to extend our commerce to other lands; that we want the home market, with its doors closed to Europe and to all outside powers, a portion of our people producing and a portion manufacturing and then trading amongst themselves and living among themselves? That argument vanishes into thin air, too. Here they are undertaking to extend our territorial dominion, under the specious plea that it will give us an enlarged market for our surplus products. Oh, Mr. President, those arguments will not deceive the American people any longer. You have by a policy of your own, which I believe the majority of the American people condemn, depopulated almost the mountain States. You tell me you want this territory for the surplus population of the United States. We have no surplus population. We have scarcely 15 or 16 inhabitants to the square mile in this country. Fifty years from now would see by natural growth 200,000,000 people in the United States without any annexation, numerically one of the most powerful, and in point of wealth, if well conducted, the most powerful nation of ancient or modern times.

So it can not be that we have a surplus population which we want to get rid of. We have no class of people who will go to the Philippines, or to Hawaii, or to Cuba, or to Puerto Rico, or to any of those islands, except for mere trading purposes, and then probably only one inhabitant out of a hundred thousand. Those islands are not to catch any surplus population from here, because we have none to give them. We, upon the other hand, are to be the recipients of their population as competitors in the labor market against our laborers and our producers; and you never will be able to deceive the American people, when they come to analyze this question, into the belief that there is anything lofty or patriotic in the scheme of annexation.

Mr. President, let us look for a moment at the conditions prevailing in the Hawaiian Islands. It is said they have a republic there. That statement is not true. They do not have and never have had a republic. They have a revolutionary government which has some of the features of a republic, but there is an absolute absence of all the substance of a republic. Out of a total adult male population numbering, I think, thirty-seven or thirty-eight thousand, possibly more, they have not 3,000 voters. All

the others are disqualified by property qualifications, to be found in their constitution; and so weak and uncertain and vacillating and so absolutely uncontrollable are the people of that country that their constitution authorizes their enslavement and the enforcement of personal contracts to labor.

Can such a people be a desirable acquisition to the United States? Are we to take them with all the restraints of their constitution and statutes, and are we to incorporate into the United States slavery, an institution against which we declared by constitutional amendment? Yet I submit to the lawyers on the other side that if we take the institutions of the Hawaiian Islands as they are, with their contracts and their constitution, and statutes in the nature of contracts, we have not the power under our form of government to abrogate those contracts, statutes, and constitution. Slavery will exist in the future as it existed in the past in our country.

Mr. President, the significance of the pending joint resolution for the acquisition or "annexation" of Hawaii no longer rests upon the theories originally advanced to support it as set forth in the message of the President and as presented by the advocates of the proposition. They were measurably sordid in so far as they appealed to commercialism, or semipatriotic in that they pretended that "annexation" was necessary for our defense, and humane to the extent of the intimation conveyed that the Hawaiians needed protection from external foes. But all these arguments have each in turn been overthrown and shown to be either valueless or groundless.

The result is that "annexation" now stands forth as a war measure, with nothing, however, in the committee's report to sustain it as such, while an educated silence on this floor by its supporters leaves us to grapple with so important a question as this in the dark. Why is this?

The truth is, the annexation of Hawaii has come to be an incident of an imperial policy that was not dreamed of when the treaty was presented or the report made on the annexation resolutions. That policy cast its shadow across the sky when Admiral Dewey sunk the Spanish fleet in the Bay of Manila on May 1, 1898.

On the 20th of April, 1898, Congress passed the following preamble and resolutions:

Whereas the abhorrent conditions which have existed for more than three years in the Island of Cuba, so near our own borders, have shocked the moral sense of the people of the United States, have been a disgrace to Christian civilization, culminating, as they have, in the destruction of a United States battle ship, with 266 of its officers and crew, while on a friendly visit in the harbor of Havana, and can not longer be endured, as has been set forth by the President of the United States in his message to Congress of April 11, 1898, upon which the action of Congress was invited: Therefore,

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, First. That the people of the Island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.

Mr. President, it is quite evident that the scheme of colonization had not completely unfolded at that time, as is made still more evident by the amendment to the resolutions offered by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER]. The people of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent. We had something of a controversy over the question whether they are free, but we agreed that the people of that country ought to be free and independent. How, sir, could we do otherwise in the light of our history and our traditions?

We based our Government on the doctrine promulgated in the Declaration of Independence that all men are born free and equal and are by nature entitled to certain inalienable rights, which are mentioned in the declaration. We did not say that all men in the United States were born free and equal, but we said all men wherever they are born stand upon terms of equality and they are entitled to certain rights, among which we enumerated life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We assumed and waged our Revolutionary struggle on the theory that every man who dwelt upon this territory during that struggle would be a citizen of the Government to be formed here and an equal participant in it.

There is a republic to-day declared to exist in Hawaii. A republican form of government has been proclaimed in the Philippine Islands and in Cuba, and I do not know but in Puerto Rico. There is at least some form of revolutionary government in Puerto Rico. Less than two months ago we declared that those people had a right to their independence. Are we now to stultify our action? Are we now to retrace our steps in the eyes of the civilized world and say that we were guilty of falsehood at that time; that we really meant that it was our purpose to annex them and make them a portion of the population and Government of the United States?

But since then imperialism has constantly pushed itself to the front. The time has come when the scheme must be unfolded and pushed here. While we are engaged in the excitement and struggle of a war this great question is thrust forward, in my judgment, so that many of us can not contest it for fear that we shall be misunderstood by our constituents. It is not a wise course to pursue. Why should not this question go over to the conclusion of the war and until the next session of Congress, when we

can come together and consider it with that candor, intelligence, and deliberation its great magnitude requires? No, Mr. President, answering the party lash, this scheme of annexation is to be put through under whip and spur, regardless of its consequences to the American people, now and hereafter. It is to be regretted that more moral backbone can not be found in Congress to stop this hasty legislation.

Mr. President, we were not content at that time with simply disclaiming any right to exercise jurisdiction or sovereignty or control over Cuba, but we went further so that the people there and the world might understand our position, and we asserted it as our determination, when the pacification of the island is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people. There can be no mistake as to the meaning of that language. We said to Cuba and to the world, "When we shall have released the starving reconcentrados in Cuba, when we shall have driven Spain from that island in consequence of her barbarity and as a penalty for sinking our battle ship and destroying our sailors, we will return to our own country and leave the government of Cuba to her own people." That was honorable, and that was the proper thing to do.

Mr. President, we held it up as something new in the history of the world, for there has never been an instance thus far of a great nation taking up the cause of a weak and poor people and, on purely Christian and humane grounds, waging a war against a foreign enemy to protect people from their oppressors. We would have stood forth in the history of the world as the proudest nation in this respect that had ever appeared upon the political horizon; and yet, sir, in less than two months from the time of that patriotic and lofty declaration we find ourselves precipitated into a discussion in Congress as to how much pelf we can get out of the war, and as to how rapidly and successfully we can confiscate the property of the people of these islands and destroy their right of self-government.

No nation can afford to be guilty of dishonor or of perfidy. The man who gains a reputation in the neighborhood in which he lives for being uncertain in his promises is always the loser. Honesty is the best policy not only in individual life, but in national life. The nation that makes and declares one thing and then seeks to accomplish the reverse of it will stand condemned in the eyes of the nations of the world as the individual would stand condemned in the eyes of the community.

Mr. President, I had prepared notes enough to consume much more time than I intend to consume. I shall not hesitate to perform my part in this drama, and I shall have no hesitancy whatever in leaving it to my constituents and to the future to demonstrate the correctness of my position.

I must not be understood in what I have said as opposing the acquisition of proper harbors in all these islands. We have, as the honorable chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and other Senators have told us, an indefeasible fee-simple title to Pearl Harbor, the only harbor of any consequence in the Hawaiian Islands. We have appropriated money for its improvement and will doubtless appropriate much more in the future. Let us hold it. Let it be a harbor of refuge for American ships where they can coal and water and repair. Let us retain proper harbors in the Philippine Islands, the most important of which I think is Manila. There are seven or eight harbors there, but that seems to be the most important one. Let us retain that harbor if necessary, or some other for the same purpose. Let us retain Havana and Santiago de Cuba, and possibly another harbor in Cuba, that our vessels may have a place to go to coal, to secure water, to make repairs, and to do whatever may be necessary in the ordinary course of navigation. Let us retain San Juan, in Puerto Rico. Let us fortify all those places if necessary, and secure all the facilities proper to be secured, and then let us quit.

Mr. President, what should become of the islands which must be lost to Spain as a consequence of this war? Some Senator may say to me, "Do you want to return them to Spain?" No, Mr. President, a thousand times no. If I had it in my power, I would dismember the Spanish dynasty and wipe it off the face of the earth. I believe I am the first man in Congress, if not the only man, who ever made that declaration. I introduced the first resolution that was ever introduced in either branch of Congress to recognize the independence of the Cuban people.

I have occupied the time of the Senate in advocating their liberation when many of the subsequent enthusiasts on the other side were elevating their noses at an angle of 45 degrees in scorn and contempt at me for consuming the time of the Senate. And yet, Mr. President, times change and men change just as the thimble-rigging game changes. Those who a few months ago were characterizing me and those of us who advocated Cuban freedom and Cuban recognition in this Chamber as jingoes, holding us up to scorn and ridicule, are now at the head of the procession. They have gone from the foot of the column to its head, and they are making the music. The balance of us are following along.

We can not return these islands to Spain. I believe Spain is a doomed nation. Mr. President, I believe that these things are

worked out in the providence of God. I believe that Spain will be succeeded by a higher and a better form of government. We may be the instruments chosen for that purpose. Let us drive Spain from the Philippine Islands, from Cuba, from Puerto Rico, from every island or possession she has in either the East or the West Indies or elsewhere. Let our war vessels go to the Spanish coast and lay waste her commercial cities unless she yields to our reasonable demands, and never let one foot of territory lost to her be returned.

Mr. President, I would go further. I would require Spain to pay every dollar of the expenses of this war. I would make a statement of what it costs this Government to subdue her and to carry out the purposes of the resolution we passed here, and every dollar of that money should be paid to this Government before the war would be declared at an end.

I would do more than that. I would make her pay the value of the *Maine* and her armament that was sunk in Havana Harbor on the 15th of February last. I would make her pay, as far as money could do it, for every one of our 266 seamen who were blown into eternity at that time and every one who was injured or maimed. After she had relinquished her power or her jurisdiction over the islands, after she had paid the war debt and paid for the destruction of the *Maine* and of our sailors, after she had apologized to the Christian world for her barbarity and furled her dirty flag and left this continent forever, I would declare peace, and not before that time.

Well, what is to become of the islands, some gentleman asks? Mr. President, I would erect every one of those islands into a republican form of government. We declared that the people of Cuba were entitled to their independence. The same reasoning that we applied to Cuba will apply to the Hawaiian Islands, to the Philippines, and to Puerto Rico. The argument that applies to one applies to all. On all those islands that dot the sea I would erect and sustain an independent republican form of government, giving them moral aid and support, as we have other islands in the past, and I would demonstrate to the world in time that all the Western Hemisphere was dedicated in different sections and in different republics to the cause of a government by the people and for the people. There is the true solution.

If you incorporate them into our population you will impair our civilization and weaken our Government. We can not permit them to go back to Spain, nor can we permit them to go under the influences of other European powers. But, Mr. President, following out the high destiny of this Republic and its own teachings, we can erect them, and we will erect them, into republics to add to the grand galaxy of republics, which must eventually control the world.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a document the pamphlet which I hold in my hand, entitled *Analysis of the Functions of Money*, by WILLIAM M. STEWART, United States Senator from Nevada.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not wish it to be understood that I am not cognizant of the fact that this is the pamphlet to the printing of which I objected the other day, but I do not feel like insisting upon that objection in view of the fact that it is the product of the brain of a noted United States Senator.

Mr. WHITE. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk to the pending joint resolution, and ask that a vote may be taken on the same.

Mr. TELLER. Let it be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out from the preamble the words "in due form" and insert in lieu thereof "by a treaty which has never been ratified, but is now pending in the Senate of the United States."

Mr. DAVIS. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota moves to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. FAULKNER. I ask the Senator from Minnesota whether he will not withdraw the motion? There will be no debate on the amendment, I think. Let us vote directly on it.

Mr. WHITE. What was the motion of the Senator from Minnesota?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. To lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. WHITE. I hope the Senator from Minnesota will not insist upon that motion. Such amendments as may be offered will probably be briefly explained, and it will only lead to the necessity of debating other matters and to procrastination. I ask for a direct vote on the amendment.

Mr. DAVIS. It is entirely immaterial to me, and I withdraw the motion, but I shall make that motion as to all other amendments, and do not wish my action now to be drawn into precedent.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The motion to lay the amendment on the table is withdrawn.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Senators who have amendments to offer and wish to discuss them had better discuss them in advance of their being offered, in view of the notice given by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], that he will move to lay all amendments on the table without regard to their merit.

Mr. PETTIGREW. It seems to me if we can have a direct vote on the amendments to be offered we can arrange to dispose of the matter to-night.

Mr. DAVIS. That may develop as we go along. I am not strenuous about it, but my present impression is in relation to this particular case that the motion should be made.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope the amendment will be again read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out from the preamble of the joint resolution, in the first line, the words "in due form" and insert "by a treaty which has never been ratified, but is now pending in the Senate of the United States;" so that, if amended, the preamble would read:

Whereas the Government of the Republic of Hawaii having, by a treaty which has never been ratified, but is now pending in the Senate of the United States, signified its consent, in the manner provided by its constitution, etc.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President—

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator from Colorado will excuse me for just a second, the point of this amendment is simply this: The joint resolution recites that "the Republic of Hawaii having, in due form, signified its consent," this amendment recites what was done, to wit, the making of a treaty, so far as they could make it, and the fact that such treaty is now pending in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I do not intend to detain the Senate more than a moment or two.

I take it from the statement made by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW], that the debate on the part of those who have been opposing this joint resolution is practically concluded.

I have refrained from debating this resolution, not because I supposed we who favor annexation could not hold our own in the debate, but because I was anxious to get to a vote.

I think, however, I ought to say, as one of those who have been very much interested in this question and in the final result, that in consideration of very many things which have been said in the public press, as one of those in favor of the joint resolution, I want to acquit our opponents of any unfair treatment of this subject. I do not mean by that remark that I think they have presented sound and cogent arguments, but I mean to say, holding the views they do, I do not think there has been any unnecessary delay in this debate.

I do not think there is any call for the complaint which has been made in certain quarters—not here—of an intentional purpose on the part of those who do not favor the joint resolution to unduly procrastinate action upon it.

I confess, Mr. President, if I entertained the opinion which certain Senators do who have addressed the Senate, whose honesty I can not question, I should not myself have been willing to have seen this resolution go through without extended debate.

I have not felt that there was any great threat by the passage of this resolution, but I know Senators whose judgment is as good as mine, whose patriotism is equal to mine, whose intelligence is equal to mine, entertain very different views on that question.

I wish to repeat—and I have risen only for that purpose—in justice to those Senators that I think they have been moved by patriotic motives to avoid what they think to be a great evil, or a possible evil, and that they have not abused the privileges of the Senate, nor in any way unnecessarily prolonged this discussion.

Mr. President, I want to say one other word, and then I will take my seat. Fortunately, this has not been a political question. It has been advocated here by an Administration with which I am in no wise in accord except, perhaps, upon this question and the other question which is before us now, the conduct of the war.

Senators who are in close relations with the Administration, who stand near to it, have been against this resolution—men who have had such relations with the Executive that it is fair to presume that the Executive has been impartial and has not attempted to press his views, whatever they may be, upon the Senate or the country with reference to this resolution. In the House of Representatives the great body of that House were for this resolution, Democrats, Republicans, and Populists alike, and the most conspicuous member of the Republican party in that body has been notoriously against the resolution.

So it can not be said, Mr. President, that this has been a political question, and I congratulate the Senate and I congratulate the country that we have debated it in good temper, and that we have apparently now reached a time when we are to have a vote.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I have been connected with the question of the annexation of the Republic of Hawaii ever since January, 1894. My own views upon the various questions to which the change of government in that island during that month gave rise have been well known, have been frequently expressed,

and they have remained unchanged after the debate to which, from time to time, they have been subjected.

The question is one upon which men of equal capacity for judgment, equal learning, and equal integrity may well differ, and upon which they have differed. In all the time which has passed since the matter became one for discussion in this body I have never had occasion to feel that there was anything but an honest conviction moving every person who brought his mind to deliberate upon the subject, whether for or against the territorial and sovereign acquisition of those islands.

I wish to say here, Mr. President, that during the time in which I have been in charge of the present measure, for the last two weeks and more, it has never occurred to me that any portion of the debate has been other than the expression of an honest conviction of opinion; and it has never been indulged in beyond the fair and necessary exigencies of a full and fair discussion.

It is just, Mr. President, in reference to some things which have been said, that I should say one word more, and perhaps I trench somewhat upon the proprieties and rules of this body in saying it—but what I wish to observe is this, that while it has been commented upon, sometimes with a little touch of asperity, that those, or at least many of those, and especially the Committee on Foreign Relations, who have been in charge of and who have favored this measure have not participated in this particular debate, yet I beg leave to say that, so far as we are concerned, in 1894 we covered much of the entire ground which has been traversed so ably by the opponents of the resolution within the last two weeks, and that on another occasion, concerning which it will not be proper for me to say anything more definite, our views were fully expressed to our fellows upon other questions which have been urged by the opposition.

Now, Mr. President, that we are approaching the final determination of this great question, upon which Senators have differed so widely and which has been discussed by all the organs of public opinion in its various aspects for many years, I take occasion to repeat my assurance and conviction that the entire debate—the earnest and able debate on the part of those who have opposed this measure—has not transcended the proper and legitimate limits of a fair parliamentary opposition.

I can not forbear mentioning that this great measure has been supported and opposed and will be decided not upon the lines of political division, but upon convictions of duty and patriotism, with which the dictates of party have not interfered. This feature of the debate has been manifest throughout its entire course.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I have never had for years any doubt in my mind that the Hawaiian Islands were destined to a complete union with the United States. To all intents and purposes, except sovereignty, these islands for years have been an appendage of the United States. Their business is ours; their property is largely owned and controlled by men who have gone there from the United States. There are sections of the United States, especially the one which I represent, where the intercourse has been near.

Fifty years ago, from the State of Maine, an eminent man in political life, a member of Congress, a distinguished man in the old Whig party, in whose teachings I was brought up, left the State of Maine, emigrated to the Hawaiian Islands, became a leading lawyer and chief justice of that kingdom, and was afterwards for years its minister here. With him many from the State of Maine went to Hawaii, casting their fortunes with him, returned to Maine and married. Their associations have all been continued, and the tendency of New England, especially in Maine, has been in thought that these islands belong to us. Long before they were captivated by any dream, any fancy, by the dangerous and illusory phantom of foreign conquest, our people felt that Hawaii should belong to the United States.

I vote for the acquisition of Hawaii now not in any way as a war measure, not associated with the progress of the war, not marked in any way as a stepping-stone to anything else, but because of reasons that had matured and become convincing to my mind long before war was agreed upon.

We have to-day a moral protectorate over the Hawaiian Islands, and it is the sense, I believe, of the American people that the union should be made complete. To me it does not involve statehood, but only a union, to be settled hereafter upon territorial grounds, limits, and precedents. Therefore I have no hesitation in voting for the resolution.

I have never had any doubt that we should come in due season to a vote upon this most important question. I have, as has the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, appreciated the doubt and hesitation and fears Senators have entertained upon this matter. I do not think the debate has been unduly prolonged or with any purpose of resorting to undue tactics; but the importance of the subject has been such that it should have been, as it has been, thoroughly ventilated and thoroughly discussed here.

I do not think that any great question coming before the Senate of the United States, where the majority is in favor of action, positive action, will ever be turned "awry and lose the name of

action" under the present rules. Out of them at last we come to final results, in which the majority has its way, as we are nigh to coming now upon the Hawaiian question.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from California [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. I call for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GALLINGER (when Mr. CHANDLER's name was called). My colleague [Mr. CHANDLER] has a general pair with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. MCENERY]. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST]. An arrangement has been made whereby my colleague will stand paired with the Senator from Missouri on all questions relating to Hawaiian annexation; so that the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Minnesota will be permitted to vote.

Mr. CULLOM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY]. I take the liberty of transferring that pair to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY], and will cast my vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. GEAR (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. GORMAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] on all questions relating to this joint resolution and the amendments to it, but in view of the absence of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. MURPHY] I transfer that pair to him, and will make this announcement now for all the votes on this question. I vote "nay."

Mr. HANNA (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. RAWLINS] who is absent. If he were present, he would vote "yea" on this proposition, and I should vote "nay."

Mr. JONES of Arkansas (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] who is absent, but I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES], and announce the pair between those Senators for the day. I vote "yea."

Mr. LINDSAY (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN]. If he were here, I should vote "yea."

Mr. BURROWS (when Mr. McMILLAN's name was called). My colleague [Mr. McMILLAN] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. MARTIN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANTLE]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. CARTER. My colleague [Mr. MANTLE] is absent because of conditions which he could not possibly control. If present, he would vote "nay" on this question.

Mr. SULLIVAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. MASON]. He does not appear to have voted, and so I withhold my vote.

Mr. THURSTON (when his name was called). I am paired on the pending question with the Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. McLAURIN (when Mr. TILLMAN's name was called). My colleague [Mr. TILLMAN] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MASON] on this question. If present, my colleague would vote "yea."

Mr. WARREN. I ask the attention of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. McLAURIN]. I desire to announce that before the departure of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] he arranged that I should stand paired with him; but on the announcement lately made by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. McLAURIN], I take it now that I am at liberty to vote.

Mr. McLAURIN. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. Then I vote "nay."

Mr. WELLINGTON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER]. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] has a pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WETMORE]. We have mutually agreed to transfer our pairs and both vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GALLINGER (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS]. I voted—

Mr. FRYE. I suggest to the Senator that he transfer his pair to the Senator from New York [Mr. PLATT].

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not observe that the Senator from Texas is in the Chamber, and I will transfer my pair to the Senator from New York [Mr. PLATT], and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I am informed since the announcement I made a moment ago that the pair of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MASON] has been transferred to another Senator. Therefore I am free to vote, and I vote "nay."

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I am requested to announce that the junior

Senator from New York [Mr. PLATT] is unavoidably absent. If present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. PENROSE. I am paired with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. KENNEY], who is absent. Were he present, I should vote "nay."

I also desire to state on behalf of my colleague [Mr. QUAY], who is necessarily absent, that he is paired with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY]. Were my colleague present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. LINDSAY. I call the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania to the fact that I am paired with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN], who is absent. If the Senator from Pennsylvania will agree to transfer the pair of the Senator from Delaware to the Senator from Michigan, we can both vote.

Mr. PENROSE. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. WHITE. I do not understand the statement of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with reference to the vote of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. KENNEY]. Do I understand the statement to be that the Senator from Delaware with whom the Senator from Pennsylvania is paired would vote "yea" upon this proposition?

Mr. PENROSE. Yes, I so understood; and I therefore withheld my vote.

Mr. WHITE. Very well.

Mr. PENROSE. I will, however, make the transfer of pairs suggested by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY], and that will enable us both to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. LINDSAY. Under that arrangement I am at liberty to vote, and I vote "yea."

Mr. BACON (after having voted in the affirmative). The junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WETMORE], with whom I am paired, is absent; but under the announcement made by the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLINGTON], I will permit my vote to stand, the pairs having been transferred as stated by him.

Mr. COCKRELL (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], and did not note that he was not in the Senate Chamber at the time I voted. He would doubtless vote "nay," and I did vote "yea," but, observing my pair, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should have announced that if the Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES] were present, he would have voted "yea" on this proposition.

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 40; as follows:

YEAS—20.

Allen,	Chilton,	Lindsay,	Pettigrew,
Bacon,	Clay,	McEnery,	Roach,
Bate,	Daniel,	Mallory,	Turley,
Berry,	Faulkner,	Mitchell,	Turpie,
Caffery,	Jones, Ark.	Pasco,	White.

NAYS—40.

Baker,	Foraker,	McBride,	Proctor,
Burrows,	Frye,	McLaurin,	Sewell,
Cannon,	Gallinger,	Money,	Shoup,
Carter,	Gorman,	Morgan,	Spooner,
Clark,	Hale,	Nelson,	Sullivan,
Cullom,	Hansbrough,	Penrose,	Teller,
Davis,	Hawley,	Perkins,	Warren,
Deboe,	Hoar,	Pettus,	Wellington,
Elkins,	Kyle,	Platt, Conn.	Wilson,
Fairbanks,	Lodge,	Pritchard,	Wolcott.

NOT VOTING—23.

Aldrich,	Harris,	Mills,	Thurston,
Allison,	Heitfeld,	Morrill,	Tillman,
Butler,	Jones, Nev.	Murphy,	Turner,
Chandler,	Kenney,	Platt, N. Y.	Vest,
Cockrell,	McMillan,	Quay,	Wetmore.
Gear,	Mantle,	Rawlins,	
Gray,	Martin,	Smith,	
Hanna,	Mason,	Stewart,	

So Mr. WHITE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert at the proper place the following:

That the contract-labor laws and all laws, civil or criminal, now in force in said islands by which men are held for service for a definite term, except in punishment for crime whereof the party has been duly convicted, are hereby repealed.

Mr. DAVIS. Let us have a direct vote.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. PETTIGREW. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GALLINGER (when Mr. CHANDLER's name was called). I will again announce that my colleague [Mr. CHANDLER] has a general pair with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. MCENERY], which has been transferred to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST]. If my colleague were here, he would vote against all amendments to the pending joint resolution, and would vote for

the joint resolution. I will make no further announcement concerning the matter during the roll calls.

Mr. COCKRELL. If my colleague [Mr. VEST] were present, he would vote just the other way, exactly.

Mr. CULLOM (when his name was called). I will announce once more that I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY]. I have transferred my pair, by consent, to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY]. I am not aware how the senior Senator from Delaware would vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS]. I transfer my pair to the Senator from New York [Mr. PLATT], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. GEAR (when his name was called). Again I announce my pair with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] on all questions relating to the joint resolution. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas (when the name of Mr. JONES of Nevada was called). The Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH]. If the Senator from Nevada were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. LINDSAY (when his name was called). I again announce my general pair with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN]. With the consent of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], I will continue the arrangement and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SPOONER (when his name was called). Upon these questions I am paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. PLATT]. I understand he would vote with the committee on this question. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. GALLINGER. Upon the statement made by the Senator from Wisconsin it seems to me it is proper that I should annul the pair I announced between the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. PLATT]. I will transfer my pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS], who is my regular pair, to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART], and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. THURSTON (when his name was called). On these questions I am paired with the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER]. If he were present and I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). Inasmuch as my pair with the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER] has been transferred to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. THURSTON], and as the special pair I had with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] has been transferred to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MASON], I will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WELLINGTON (when his name was called). I have a general pair, as I formerly announced, with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER]. I understand the Senator from Utah [Mr. RAWLINS] is absent unpaired, and that if he were present he would vote with the majority on this question. I therefore transfer my pair to him, and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MARTIN. I am paired with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANTLE]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 41; as follows:

YEAS—22.

Allen,	Chilton,	Lindsay,	Roach,
Bacon,	Clay,	McEnery,	Turley,
Bate,	Cockrell,	Mallory,	Turpie,
Berry,	Daniel,	Mitchell,	White.
Caffery,	Faulkner,	Pasco,	
Cannon,	Jones, Ark.	Pettigrew,	

NAYS—41.

Allison,	Frye,	McLaurin,	Shoup,
Baker,	Gallinger,	Money,	Sullivan,
Burrows,	Gorman,	Morgan,	Teller,
Carter,	Hale,	Nelson,	Warren,
Clark,	Hanna,	Penrose,	Wellington,
Cullom,	Hansbrough,	Perkins,	Wetmore,
Davis,	Hawley,	Pettus,	Wilson,
Deboe,	Hoar,	Platt, Conn.	Wolcott.
Elkins,	Kyle,	Pritchard,	
Fairbanks,	Lodge,	Proctor,	
Foraker,	McBride,	Sewell,	

NOT VOTING—23.

Aldrich,	Jones, Nev.	Morrill,	Stewart,
Butler,	Kenney,	Murphy,	Thurston,
Chandler,	McMillan,	Platt, N. Y.	Tillman,
Gear,	Mantle,	Quay,	Turner,
Gray,	Martin,	Rawlins,	Vest.
Harris,	Mason,	Smith,	
Heitfeld,	Mills,	Spooner,	

So Mr. PETTIGREW's amendment was rejected.

Mr. BACON. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert the following:

That this resolution shall not be operative and of binding effect upon either the United States of America or the Republic of Hawaii until the same shall have been consented to and approved by the majority of the voters voting at an election to be held in the Hawaiian Islands, at which

election all male natives of said islands of the age of 21 years, and all naturalized male persons in said islands of the age of 21 years, shall be duly qualified voters. The said election shall be held at a time and in the manner and under regulations to be prescribed by the President of the United States.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BACON. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. HARRIS], but under a special arrangement in regard to questions arising under the joint resolution, I will vote in his absence. I vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I will again announce my pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS], and state that my pair has been transferred to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART]. I will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. GEAR (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. LINDSAY (when his name was called). Continuing the arrangement with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], I will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. PENROSE (when his name was called). Under the explanation of pairs made by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY], I will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SPOONER (when his name was called). On this question I am paired with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. PLATT], who is absent. I understand that if he were present, he would vote "nay," and if I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. THURSTON (when his name was called). I am paired on the pending question with the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER]. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. WELLINGTON (when his name was called). Under the arrangement previously announced I will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 20, nays 42; as follows:

YEAS—20.			
Allen,	Chilton,	Lindsay,	Pettigrew,
Bacon,	Clay,	McEnery,	Roach,
Bate,	Cockrell,	Mallory,	Turley,
Berry,	Faulkner,	Mitchell,	Turpie,
Caffery,	Jones, Ark.	Pasco,	White.
NAYS—42.			
Allison,	Foraker,	McBride,	Sewell,
Baker,	Frye,	McLaurin,	Shoup,
Burrows,	Gallinger,	Money,	Sullivan,
Cannon,	Gorman,	Morgan,	Teller,
Carter,	Hale,	Nelson,	Warren,
Clark,	Hanna,	Penrose,	Wellington,
Cullom,	Hansbrough,	Perkins,	Wetmore,
Davis,	Hawley,	Pettus,	Wilson,
Deboe,	Hoar,	Platt, Conn.	Wolcott.
Elkins,	Kyle,	Pritchard,	
Fairbanks,	Lodge,	Proctor,	
NOT VOTING—27.			
Aldrich,	Heitfeld,	Mills,	Spooner,
Butler,	Jones, Nev.	Morrill,	Stewart,
Chandler,	Kenney,	Murphy,	Thurston,
Daniel,	McMillan,	Platt, N. Y.	Tillman,
Gear,	Mantle,	Quay,	Turner,
Gray,	Martin,	Rawlins,	Vest.
Harris,	Mason,	Smith,	

So Mr. BACON's amendment was rejected.

Mr. FAULKNER. On page 2, commencing in line 18, after the word "exercised," I move to strike out the word "in" and all of line 19 and substitute what I send to the desk. That portion of the bill which I move to strike out confers upon the President the power and directs him to provide the manner and mode of exercising judicial and civil offices in the Island of Hawaii.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from West Virginia will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 18, page 2, it is proposed to strike out the following:

In such manner as the President of the United States shall direct.

And insert in lieu thereof:

Under and by authority of the existing laws of said islands not in conflict with the Constitution and laws of the United States.

Mr. FAULKNER. I ask that the text be read as it would read if amended.

The Secretary read as follows:

Until Congress shall provide for the government of such islands all the civil, judicial, and military powers exercised by the officers of the existing government in said islands shall be vested in such person or persons and shall be exercised under and by authority of the existing laws of said islands not in conflict with the Constitution and laws of the United States, and the President shall have power to remove said officers and fill the vacancies so occasioned.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER].

Mr. FAULKNER. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). Under the arrangement made, whereby the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS]

stands paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART], I will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. GEAR (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and withhold my vote.

Mr. SPOONER (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. PLATT]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. THURSTON (when his name was called). I am paired on the pending question with the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER]. I am satisfied, however, that his vote would be the same as my own on this particular amendment. I will, therefore, vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 20, nays 43; as follows:

YEAS—20.			
Allen,	Chilton,	Lindsay,	Pettigrew,
Bacon,	Clay,	McEnery,	Roach,
Bate,	Cockrell,	Mallory,	Turley,
Berry,	Faulkner,	Mitchell,	Turpie,
Caffery,	Jones, Ark.	Pasco,	White.
NAYS—43.			
Allison,	Foraker,	McBride,	Sewell,
Baker,	Frye,	McLaurin,	Shoup,
Burrows,	Gallinger,	Money,	Sullivan,
Cannon,	Gorman,	Morgan,	Teller,
Carter,	Hale,	Nelson,	Thurston,
Clark,	Hanna,	Penrose,	Warren,
Cullom,	Hansbrough,	Perkins,	Wellington,
Davis,	Hawley,	Pettus,	Wetmore,
Deboe,	Hoar,	Platt, Conn.	Wilson,
Elkins,	Kyle,	Pritchard,	Wolcott.
Fairbanks,	Lodge,	Proctor,	
NOT VOTING—23.			
Aldrich,	Heitfeld,	Mills,	Spooner,
Butler,	Jones, Nev.	Morrill,	Stewart,
Chandler,	Kenney,	Murphy,	Tillman,
Daniel,	McMillan,	Platt, N. Y.	Turner,
Gear,	Mantle,	Quay,	Vest.
Gray,	Martin,	Rawlins,	
Harris,	Mason,	Smith,	

So Mr. FAULKNER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALLEN. I offer the following amendment, on which I should like a yeas-and-nay vote.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. Add the following proviso:

Provided, That it is hereby made a condition hereof that upon all sugars hereafter imported or coming into the United States from the Hawaiian Islands there shall be imposed an excise or internal-revenue tax of 1 cent per pound for the period of ten years from and after the passage and acceptance by the Hawaiian Legislature of this joint resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays are demanded on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN].

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GEAR (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. MCENERY (when his name was called). Under the arrangement heretofore announced, by which the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] stands paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SPOONER (when his name was called). I understand that if the Senator from New York [Mr. PLATT], with whom I am paired, were present, he would vote "nay" upon this amendment. I shall therefore vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. THURSTON (when his name was called). I am paired on the pending question with the Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. MCLAURIN (when Mr. TILLMAN's name was called). I again announce that my colleague [Mr. TILLMAN] is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I am paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 4, nays 57; as follows:

YEAS—4.			
Allen,	McEnery,	Morrill,	Pettigrew.
NAYS—57.			
Allison,	Deboe,	McBride,	Shoup,
Bacon,	Elkins,	McLaurin,	Spooner,
Baker,	Fairbanks,	Mallory,	Sullivan,
Bate,	Foraker,	Mitchell,	Teller,
Berry,	Frye,	Money,	Turley,
Burrows,	Gallinger,	Morgan,	Turpie,
Cannon,	Gorman,	Nelson,	Warren,
Carter,	Hale,	Pasco,	Wellington,
Chilton,	Hanna,	Penrose,	Wetmore,
Clay,	Hansbrough,	Perkins,	White,
Cullom,	Hawley,	Pettus,	Wilson,
Davis,	Hoar,	Platt, Conn.	Wolcott.
	Kyle,	Pritchard,	
	Lindsay,	Proctor,	
	Lodge,	Sewell,	

NOT VOTING—23.

Aldrich,
Butler,
Chandler,
Cockrell,
Faulkner,
Gear,
Gray,

Harris,
Heitfeld,
Jones, Ark.
Jones, Nev.
Kenney,
McMillan,
Mantle,

Martin,
Mason,
Mills,
Murphy,
Platt, N. Y.
Quay,
Rawlins,

Roach,
Smith,
Stewart,
Thurston,
Tillman,
Turner,
Vest.

So Mr. ALLEN's amendment was rejected.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert the following:

That all male persons over 21 years of age who were born on said islands and are citizens thereof, and all male persons over 21 years of age who have been naturalized according to the laws of Hawaii, shall be entitled to vote at all elections hereafter held in said islands.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW].

Mr. PETTIGREW. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GEAR (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. JONES of Arkansas (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. SPOONER (when his name was called). I am informed that if the Senator from New York [Mr. PLATT], with whom I am paired, were present, he would vote "nay." I will therefore vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. THURSTON (when his name was called). Upon the pending question I am paired with the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER], but I am satisfied that our votes would be the same on this particular amendment. I will therefore vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. COCKRELL. I am paired with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. MURPHY]. I do not know how he would vote on this question, and therefore I will refrain from voting.

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 48; as follows:

YEAS—16.

Allen,
Bacon,
Bate,
Berry,

Caffery,
Cannon,
Daniel,
Faulkner,

Lindsay,
McEnery,
Mallory,
Mitchell,

Pasco,
Pettigrew,
Turley,
White.

NAYS—48.

Allison,
Baker,
Burrows,
Carter,
Chilton,
Clark,
Clay,
Cullom,
Davis,
Deboe,
Elkins,
Fairbanks,

Foraker,
Frye,
Gallinger,
Gorman,
Hale,
Hanna,
Hansbrough,
Hawley,
Hoar,
Jones, Nev.
Kyle,
Lodge,

McBride,
McLaurin,
Money,
Morgan,
Morrill,
Nelson,
Penrose,
Perkins,
Pettus,
Platt, Conn.
Pritchard,
Proctor,

Roach,
Sewell,
Shoup,
Spooner,
Sullivan,
Teller,
Thurston,
Warren,
Wellington,
Wetmore,
Wilson,
Wolcott.

NOT VOTING—25.

Aldrich,
Butler,
Chandler,
Cockrell,
Gear,
Gray,
Harris,

Heitfeld,
Jones, Ark.
Kenney,
McMillan,
Mantle,
Martin,
Mason,

Mills,
Murphy,
Platt, N. Y.
Quay,
Rawlins,
Smith,
Stewart,

Tillman,
Turner,
Turpie,
Vest.

So Mr. PETTIGREW's amendment was rejected.

Mr. LINDSAY. I desire to offer by way of a substitute the printed matter in the pamphlet which I send to the desk, commencing on page 96, with article 1, and ending on page 97, with article 7, to come in after the resolving clause.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. Strike out all after the resolving clause, on page 1, and insert the following:

1. The Republic of Hawaii hereby cedes absolutely and without reserve to the United States of America all rights of sovereignty of whatsoever kind in and over the Hawaiian Islands and their dependencies; and it is agreed that all territory of and appertaining to the Republic of Hawaii is hereby annexed to the United States of America under the name of the Territory of Hawaii.

2. The Republic of Hawaii also cedes and hereby transfers to the United States the absolute fee and ownership of all public, Government, or crown lands, public buildings, or edifices, ports, harbors, military equipments, and all other public property of every kind and description, belonging to the Government of the Hawaiian Islands, together with every right and appurtenance thereunto appertaining.

The existing laws of the United States relative to public lands shall not apply to such lands in the Hawaiian Islands, but the Congress of the United States shall enact special laws for their management and disposition: *Provided*, That all revenues from or proceeds of the same, except as regards such part thereof as may be used or occupied for the civil, military, or naval purposes of the United States, or may be assigned for the use of the local government, shall be used solely for the benefit of the inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands for educational and other public purposes.

3. Until Congress shall provide for the government of such islands, all the civil, judicial, and military powers exercised by the officers of the existing Government in said islands shall be vested in such person or persons and

shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct; and the President shall have power to remove said officers and fill the vacancies so occasioned.

The existing treaties of the Hawaiian Islands with foreign nations shall forthwith cease and determine, being replaced by such treaties as may exist or as may be hereafter concluded between the United States and such foreign nations. The municipal legislation of the Hawaiian Islands, not enacted for the fulfillment of the treaties so extinguished, and not inconsistent with this treaty nor contrary to the Constitution of the United States, nor to any existing treaty of the United States, shall remain in force until the Congress of the United States shall otherwise determine.

Until legislation shall be enacted extending the United States customs laws and regulations to the Hawaiian Islands, the existing customs relations of the Hawaiian Islands with the United States and other countries shall remain unchanged.

4. The public debt of the Republic of Hawaii, lawfully existing at the date of the exchange of the ratifications of the treaty, including the amounts due to depositors in the Hawaiian Postal Savings Bank, is hereby assumed by the Government of the United States, but the liability of the United States in this regard shall in no case exceed \$4,000,000. So long, however, as the existing Government and the present commercial relations of the Hawaiian Islands are continued, as hereinbefore provided, said Government shall continue to pay the interest on said debt.

5. There shall be no further immigration of Chinese into the Hawaiian Islands, except upon such conditions as are now or may hereafter be allowed by the laws of the United States, and no Chinese, by reason of anything herein contained, shall be allowed to enter the United States from the Hawaiian Islands.

6. The President shall appoint five commissioners, at least two of whom shall be residents of the Hawaiian Islands, who shall, as soon as reasonable and practicable, recommend to Congress such legislation for the Territory of Hawaii as they shall deem necessary or proper.

7. This treaty shall be ratified by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, on the one part; and by the President of the Republic of Hawaii, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in accordance with the constitution of said Republic, on the other; and the ratifications hereof shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. LINDSAY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GEAR (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SPOONER (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. PLATT], who, I am informed, if present, would vote "nay." I therefore am at liberty to vote, and I vote "nay."

Mr. THURSTON (when his name was called). On the pending question I am paired with the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER]. I am, however, satisfied that on this particular amendment our votes would be the same, and I therefore shall vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I am paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. COCKRELL. I am paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. MURPHY].

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 47; as follows:

YEAS—17.

Bacon,
Bate,
Berry,
Caffery,
Chilton,

Clay,
Daniel,
Faulkner,
Jones, Nev.
Lindsay,

McEnery,
Mallory,
Mitchell,
Pasco,
Turley,

Turpie,
White.

NAYS—47.

Allen,
Allison,
Baker,
Burrows,
Carter,
Chilton,
Clark,
Cullom,
Davis,
Deboe,
Elkins,
Fairbanks,

Foraker,
Frye,
Gallinger,
Gorman,
Hale,
Hanna,
Hansbrough,
Hawley,
Hoar,
Kyle,
Lodge,
McBride,

McLaurin,
Money,
Morgan,
Morrill,
Nelson,
Penrose,
Perkins,
Pettus,
Platt, Conn.
Pritchard,
Proctor,
Roach,

Sewell,
Shoup,
Spooner,
Sullivan,
Teller,
Thurston,
Warren,
Wellington,
Wetmore,
Wilson,
Wolcott.

NOT VOTING—25.

Aldrich,
Butler,
Chandler,
Cockrell,
Gear,
Gray,
Harris,

Heitfeld,
Jones, Ark.
Kenney,
McMillan,
Mantle,
Martin,
Mason,

Mills,
Murphy,
Pettigrew,
Platt, N. Y.
Quay,
Rawlins,
Smith,

Stewart,
Tillman,
Turner,
Vest.

So Mr. LINDSAY's amendment was rejected.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, have had under consideration the joint resolution entitled—

Mr. GEAR. I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that I offered an amendment some days ago which has not been read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator gave notice of an amendment intended to be proposed by him. Does he now offer it?

Mr. GEAR. I do.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of line 20, on page 3, it is proposed to insert:

And it is hereby agreed that the silver money coined by the Government of Hawaii shall be maintained at parity with gold the same as the silver coined in the United States.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GEAR].

The amendment was rejected.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, and read the third time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution having been read three times, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. ALLEN, Mr. FAULKNER, and others called for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GALLINGER (when Mr. CHANDLER's name was called). I desire to announce that on this vote my colleague [Mr. CHANDLER] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea" and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

Mr. COCKRELL (when his name was called). The senior Senator from New York [Mr. MURPHY] is necessarily detained from the Chamber, and I agreed to pair with him on this vote. If he were present, he would vote "yea" and I should vote "nay."

Mr. CULLOM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY]. That pair has been transferred to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY], and those two Senators have been paired upon all the votes taken touching this joint resolution. I vote "yea."

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS], but that pair has been transferred to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART], and I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. GEAR (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. BAKER (when Mr. HARRIS's name was called). I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. HARRIS] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. SHOUP (when Mr. HEITFELD's name was called). My colleague [Mr. HEITFELD] is temporarily absent from the Chamber. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. JONES of Arkansas (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. LINDSAY (when his name was called). Under the arrangement with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] I am at liberty to vote, and I vote "nay."

Mr. BURROWS (when Mr. McMILLAN's name was called). My colleague [Mr. McMILLAN] is necessarily absent and paired. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. CARTER (when Mr. MANTLE's name was called). My colleague [Mr. MANTLE] is unavoidably absent. He would, if present, vote "yea." He is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANTLE]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. PENROSE (when Mr. QUAY's name was called). My colleague [Mr. QUAY] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY]. Were he present my colleague would vote "yea."

Mr. SPOONER (when his name was called). On this question I am paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. PLATT], who is unavoidably absent. If he were present, I understand he would vote "yea," and if I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. THURSTON (when his name was called). On the pending question, I am paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER]. If he were present, he would vote "yea," and if I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. McLAURIN (when Mr. TILLMAN's name was called). My colleague [Mr. TILLMAN] is unavoidably absent. He is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MASON]. If present, my colleague would vote "nay."

Mr. WELLINGTON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER]. In this case, however, I have transferred that pair to the Senator from Utah [Mr. RAWLINS], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WETMORE. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. ALDRICH] is unavoidably absent. He is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 42, nays 21; as follows:

YEAS—42.

Allison,	Foraker,	McBride,	Sewell,
Baker,	Frye,	McLaurin,	Shoup,
Burrows,	Gallinger,	Money,	Sullivan,
Cannon,	Gorman,	Morgan,	Teller,
Carter,	Hale,	Nelson,	Warren,
Clark,	Hanna,	Penrose,	Wellington,
Cullom,	Hansbrough,	Perkins,	Wetmore,
Davis,	Hawley,	Pettus,	Wilson,
Deboe,	Hoar,	Platt, Conn.	Wolcott,
Elkins,	Kyle,	Pritchard,	
Fairbanks,	Lodge,	Proctor,	

NAYS—21.

Allen,	Clay,	Mallory,	Turley,
Bacon,	Daniel,	Mitchell,	Turpie,
Bate,	Faulkner,	Morrill,	White,
Berry,	Jones, Nev.	Pasco,	
Caffery,	Lindsay,	Pettigrew,	
Chilton,	McEnery,	Roach,	

NOT VOTING—26.

Aldrich,	Heitfeld,	Mills,	Stewart,
Butler,	Jones, Ark.	Murphy,	Thurston,
Chandler,	Kenney,	Platt, N. Y.	Tillman,
Cockrell,	McMillan,	Quay,	Turner,
Gear,	Mantle,	Rawlins,	Vest,
Gray,	Martin,	Smith,	
Harris,	Mason,	Spooner,	

So the joint resolution was passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 4710) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for the construction of a bridge across the Yalobusha River, between Leflore and Carroll counties, in the State of Mississippi," approved April 29, 1898; and

A bill (S. 4847) to provide an American register for the steamer *Titania*.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10561) to increase the force of the Ordnance Department.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10691) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for prior years, and for other purposes, recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agrees to the same with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HALE. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on the general deficiency bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives receding from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30 to the bill (H. R. 10691) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for prior years, and for other purposes, and agreeing to the same with an amendment as follows:

Add, at the end of said amendment, the following:

"Provided further, That unless the settlement herein authorized be perfected within one year after the passage of this act the President shall at once proceed to foreclose all liens now held by the United States against said railroad companies and to collect the indebtedness herein sought to be settled, and nothing in this act contained shall be held to waive or release any right, lien, or cause of action already held by the United States."

Mr. HALE. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate. The motion was agreed to.

HOUR OF MEETING.

Mr. HALE. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet to-morrow at 12 o'clock, as the order now is continuing for meeting at 11 o'clock, and this will give Senators more time.

Mr. COCKRELL. And hereafter.

Mr. MORGAN. That means hereafter.

Mr. HALE. I will change the form of the motion. I move that hereafter and until otherwise ordered the hour of meeting shall be 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HOAR. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1401) to enable volunteer soldiers during the war with Spain to vote at Congressional elections.

Several SENATORS. Oh, no.

Mr. CARTER. Pending that motion, I wish to present a conference report.

Mr. HALE. Let us have an executive session.

Mr. HOAR. I do not propose to ask the Senate to go on with the bill to-night.

Mr. GORMAN. Pending the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. HAWLEY. I hope the Senator from Maryland will not move an executive session. I have a conference report to present.

Mr. GORMAN. If the Senator from Massachusetts withdraws his motion, I shall have no objection. A conference report presents a privileged question. I withdraw the motion for an executive session in order that the conference report may be presented.

Mr. HAWLEY. I rise to present a conference report.

Mr. MALLORY. There is so much confusion in the Chamber that Senators can not hear.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Will Senators be good enough to take their seats?

Mr. HOAR. I hope the Senator from Connecticut will allow the question to be put on my motion.

Mr. HAWLEY. I yield.

Mr. GORMAN. Then I renew the motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. HOAR. I hope the motion will be voted down. I desire to have the bill taken up—

Mr. HAWLEY. So do I.

Mr. HOAR. And have it made the order for the morning.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. HAWLEY. I hope the motion will be voted down.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is not debatable.

Mr. COCKRELL. The motion is not debatable.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. GORMAN, Mr. JONES of Arkansas, and Mr. COCKRELL demanded the yeas and nays; and they were ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. GEAR (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. HANNA (when his name was called). Being paired, I withhold my vote.

Mr. THURSTON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. TURPIE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL].

Mr. WELLINGTON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GALLINGER. In behalf of my colleague [Mr. CHANDLER], I will announce that on this vote and on all subsequent votes during the day he stands paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST].

Mr. CLARK. I am paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. HARRIS]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SEWELL. I desire to inquire if the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MITCHELL] has voted?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He has not voted.

Mr. SEWELL. Being paired with that Senator, I withhold my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 29; as follows:

YEAS—23.

Bacon,	Daniel,	McLaurin,	Pettus,
Bate,	Faulkner,	Mallory,	Roach,
Berry,	Gorman,	Money,	Sullivan,
Chilton,	Jones, Ark.	Morgan,	Turley,
Clay,	Lindsay,	Pasco,	White.
Cockrell,	McEnery,	Pettigrew,	

NAYS—29.

Allison,	Elkins,	Lodge,	Shoup,
Baker,	Fairbanks,	McBride,	Spooner,
Burrows,	Foraker,	Nelson,	Teller,
Cannon,	Frye,	Penrose,	Wetmore,
Carter,	Hansbrough,	Perkins,	Wolcott.
Cullom,	Hawley,	Platt, Conn.	
Davis,	Hoar,	Pritchard,	
Deboe,	Kyle,	Proctor,	

NOT VOTING—37.

Aldrich,	Hanna,	Mitchell,	Tillman,
Allen,	Harris,	Morrill,	Turner,
Butler,	Heitfeld,	Murphy,	Turpie,
Caffery,	Jones, Nev.	Platt, N. Y.	Vest,
Chandler,	Kenney,	Quay,	Warren,
Clark,	McMillan,	Rawlins,	Wellington,
Gallinger,	Mantle,	Sewell,	Wilson.
Gear,	Martin,	Smith,	
Gray,	Mason,	Stewart,	
Hale,	Mills,	Thurston,	

So the Senate refused to proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me for one moment?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. There seems to be a disposition to filibuster against the motion I have made, and I withdraw it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The motion is withdrawn.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That is a gratuitous fling on the part of the Senator from Massachusetts, which is not justified. It is 6 o'clock, and I think a motion to adjourn can be made without any such characterization. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I hope the Senator from Arkansas will withdraw his motion. There are a number of post-office and other nominations about which Senators are extremely anxious; the session is drawing to a close, and it is somewhat important that they be acted upon.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I will withdraw the motion.

Mr. HOAR. Does the Senator insist upon my withdrawing my motion?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I do not. The Senator from Massachusetts can do as he pleases.

Mr. HOAR. Then I will adhere to my motion.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. HOAR. Then I withdraw the motion. Now, is there filibustering or not?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The motion will stand this time.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

Mr. HAWLEY. I desire to present a conference report.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I have moved that the Senate adjourn.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair understood the motion to be withdrawn three times. Is it renewed?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I renewed the motion when the Senator from Massachusetts renewed his motion.

Mr. HAWLEY. I present a conference report.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I thought a motion to adjourn could be made at any time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It can be, but it should not be withdrawn at the same moment.

Mr. HAWLEY. It can not be made when I have the floor.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas can renew his motion at any time.

HARBOR DEFENSES AND FORTIFICATIONS.

Mr. HAWLEY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 4714) to protect harbor defenses and fortifications constructed or used by the United States from malicious injury, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

1. That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same.
2. That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House in page 1, line 10, of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the words "has been," in said amendment of the House, strike out the words "or shall be."
3. That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House in page 2, line 6, of the bill, and agree to the same.

JOS. R. HAWLEY,
W. J. SEWELL,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
J. A. T. HULL,
M. GRIFFIN,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. CARTER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10561) to increase the force of the Ordnance Department, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

JOS. R. HAWLEY,
THOS. H. CARTER,
S. PASCO,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
J. A. T. HULL,
N. N. COX,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

UNIFORM SYSTEM OF BANKRUPTCY.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Certainly. I withdraw the motion.

Mr. LODGE. From the Committee on Printing I report favorably with an amendment a House concurrent resolution to print the bankruptcy act, for which I ask immediate consideration. It is very important to supply us with copies of the act.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

The amendment of the Committee on Printing was, to insert in line 9, after the word "with," the words "paper cover and;" so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed of public act No. 171, "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," 75,000 copies, 50,000 for the use of the House of Representatives and 25,000 for the use of the Senate; that such print be of the act with paper cover and index, etc., as prepared by the Clerk.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution as amended was agreed to.

PRINTING OF WAR REVENUE LAW.

Mr. LODGE. From the Committee on Printing I report a concurrent resolution, for which I ask present consideration.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution, which is as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House concurring), That there be printed 20,000 copies of the war-revenue law of 1893, with paper covers and index, 13,500 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 6,500 copies for the use of the Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is this a Senate resolution?

Mr. LODGE. No; it is not a Senate resolution. The Senate passed a resolution to print 18,000 copies for the use of the Senate alone, which is the largest number we can secure under the statutory limit of cost. This is a concurrent resolution to print 20,000 copies more, of which we get 6,500.

Mr. COCKRELL. We have already passed a resolution to print it for the use of the Senate?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; 18,000 copies.

Mr. COCKRELL. The same ought to be done as to the bankruptcy act.

Mr. LODGE. Of the bankruptcy act 75,000 copies are to be printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE MINT.

Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed and bound in cloth 6,000 copies of the Report of the Director of the Mint for the fiscal year 1897, 2,000 for the use of the House, 1,000 for the use of the Senate, and 3,000 for the use of the Bureau of the Mint.

STAFF SIGNAL OFFICERS.

Mr. SEWELL. I attempted to call up this morning the joint resolution (H. Res. 270) to correct an omission relative to signal officers on the staff of corps commanders, but there was not a copy of the bill on the desk. I ask that it may be taken up now.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments, in line 4, after the word "April," to strike out "twenty-fifth" and insert "twenty-second;" and in line 8, after the word "officer," to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That so much of the act of Congress approved August 6, 1894, as reduces the grade of the Chief Signal Officer of the Army is hereby repealed, and the colonel therein provided for shall be Assistant Chief Signal Officer and appointed, by regular promotion, upon the approval of this resolution: Provided further, That the laws authorizing the detail and assignment of the officers of the Army to duty in the Weather Bureau be, and are hereby, repealed.

So as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc., That so much of section 10 of the act of Congress approved April 23, 1893, as provides that the staff of the general commanding an Army corps shall consist of certain officers with the rank of lieutenant-colonel shall be held to include among such officers a chief signal officer: Provided, That so much of the act of Congress approved August 6, 1894, etc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A joint resolution to correct an omission relative to signal officers on the staff of corps commanders, and for other purposes."

EIGHT-HOUR LAW.

Mr. CANNON. I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 7389) limiting the hours of daily services of laborers, workmen, and mechanics employed upon the public works of or work done for the United States or any Territory or the District of Columbia be made the unfinished business.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to say that that can not be done. The unfinished business after the Hawaiian joint resolution has passed becomes the bill (S. 3698) for the res-

toration of annuities to the Sisseton and Wahpeton bands of Dakota or Sioux Indians.

Mr. CANNON. Then I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill indicated by me after the morning hour to-morrow.

Mr. MORGAN. That can not be done.

Mr. CANNON. I meant to ask that it be made the special order at the conclusion of the morning business to-morrow.

Mr. MORGAN. That is not in order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator from Utah is in order.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Pending that motion, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. CANNON. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After fifteen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, July 7, 1898, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 6, 1898.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT ATTORNEY.

Timothy F. Burke, of Wyoming, to be attorney of the United States for the district of Wyoming, vice Gibson Clark, whose term will expire September 22, 1898.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Frank A. Hadsell, of Wyoming, to be marshal of the United States for the district of Wyoming, vice John A. McDermott, whose term will expire September 22, 1898.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

P. A. Surg. Frederick A. Hesler, to be a surgeon in the Navy, from the 7th day of May, 1898, vice Surg. Charles A. Siegfried, promoted.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

FIRST REGIMENT OF ENGINEERS.

To be captain.

First Lieut. Edmund M. Sawtelle, First United States Volunteer Engineers, vice Parsons, declined.

To be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Heber R. Bishop, jr., First United States Volunteer Engineers.

To be second lieutenant.

William G. Mitchell, of New York.

THIRD REGIMENT OF ENGINEERS.

To be first lieutenant.

John W. Daniel, jr., of Virginia.

FIFTH REGIMENT OF INFANTRY.

To be assistant surgeon with the rank of first lieutenant.

John E. Davis, of Mississippi.

SEVENTH REGIMENT OF INFANTRY.

To be captain.

Robert C. Welles, of Missouri.

To be assistant surgeon with the rank of first lieutenant.

Maj. A. W. Shockley, of Missouri, vice Landry, declined.

TO BE INSPECTOR-GENERAL WITH THE RANK OF MAJOR.

Perry Belmont, of New York.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY—ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

First Lieut. Edwin B. Babbitt, to be captain, June 15, 1898.

First Lieut. Ormond M. Lissak, to be captain, June 15, 1898.

First Lieut. Beverly W. Dunn, to be captain, June 15, 1898.

First Lieut. John T. Thompson, to be captain, June 15, 1898.

TRANSFERS IN THE ARMY.

Second Lieut. Rodmond V. Beach, Second Regiment, to the First Regiment, to date from June 21, 1898.

Second Lieut. Louis B. Hamilton, First Regiment, to the Second Regiment, to date from June 21, 1898.

POSTMASTERS.

J. D. Fowler, to be postmaster at San Luis Obispo, in the county of San Luis Obispo and State of California, in the place of G. M. Payne, whose commission expired May 29, 1898.

Henry Dryhurst, to be postmaster at Meriden, in the county of New Haven and State of Connecticut, in the place of J. J. Anderson, whose commission expires July 10, 1898.

James F. Boughton, to be postmaster at Madison, in the county

of Morgan and State of Georgia, in the place of C. M. Furlow, jr., whose commission expires July 18, 1898.

Joseph J. Hamilton, to be postmaster at Rome, in the county of Floyd and State of Georgia, in the place of John M. Vandiver, removed.

E. E. Stone, to be postmaster at Dublin, in the county of Laurens and State of Georgia, in the place of V. L. Stanley, removed.

A. T. Jenkins, to be postmaster at Sullivan, in the county of Moultrie and State of Illinois, in the place of J. T. Eden, removed.

Frank E. Fritcher, to be postmaster at Nashua, in the county of Chickasaw and State of Iowa, in place of Frank E. Fritcher, whose commission expired June 16, 1898. (Reappointment.)

George S. Harris, to be postmaster at Gas City, in the county of Grant and State of Indiana, in the place of W. H. Lightle, whose commission expires July 19, 1898.

Thomas Rudd, to be postmaster at Butler, in the county of DeKalb and State of Indiana, in the place of J. J. Oberlin, whose commission expires August 2, 1898.

Archibald Shaw, to be postmaster at Lawrenceburg, in the county of Dearborn and State of Indiana, in the place of G. C. Columbia, whose commission expires August 3, 1898.

Benjamin A. Allison, to be postmaster at McPherson, in the county of McPherson and State of Kansas, in the place of Warren Knaus, whose commission expired June 7, 1898.

James Frey, to be postmaster at Enterprise, in the county of Dickinson and State of Kansas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President from and after July 1, 1898.

Sidney H. Brigham, to be postmaster at Lawrence, in the county of Essex and State of Massachusetts, in the place of J. P. Sweeney, whose commission expires August 27, 1898.

John A. Thayer, to be postmaster at Attleboro, in the county of Bristol and State of Massachusetts, in the place of G. A. Sweeney, whose commission expires August 8, 1898.

David E. Cross, to be postmaster at Amboy, in the county of Blue Earth and State of Minnesota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President from and after July 1, 1898.

John F. Wrabek, to be postmaster at New Prague, in the county of Scott and State of Minnesota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1898.

John W. Lockhart, to be postmaster at Durant, in the county of Holmes and State of Mississippi, in the place of Adeline Edwards, whose commission expired April 11, 1898.

Thomas Richardson, to be postmaster at Port Gibson, in the county of Claiborne and State of Mississippi, in the place of Harriet L. Hastings, removed.

E. H. Babcock, to be postmaster at La Plata, in the county of Macon and State of Missouri, in the place of J. W. Overstreet, removed.

Isaac N. Strawn, to be postmaster at Hopkins, in the county of Nodaway and State of Missouri, in the place of S. E. Wible, removed.

John A. Spalding, to be postmaster at Nashua, in the county of Hillsboro and State of New Hampshire, in the place of A. N. Flinn, whose commission expired June 7, 1898.

William O. Armbruster, to be postmaster at Weehawken, in the county of Hudson and State of New Jersey, in the place of R. F. Krieger, whose commission expired June 16, 1898.

Louis T. Derousse, to be postmaster at Camden, in the county of Camden and State of New Jersey, in the place of H. B. Paul, whose commission expired June 1, 1898.

William S. Jackson, to be postmaster at Belmar, in the county of Monmouth and State of New Jersey, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President from and after July 1, 1898.

George L. Hitchcock, to be postmaster at Ozone Park, in the county of Queens and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1898.

John McNally, to be postmaster at Sing Sing, in the county of Westchester and State of New York, in the place of J. I. Kane, whose commission expired January 12, 1898.

Emiel Rebell, to be postmaster at Fort Plain, in the county of Montgomery and State of New York, in the place of J. J. Witter, whose commission expired May 9, 1898.

Isaac Requa, to be postmaster at Tarrytown, in the county of Westchester and State of New York, in the place of N. H. Odell, whose commission expires July 18, 1898.

Alexander M. Long, to be postmaster at Rockingham, in the county of Richmond and State of North Carolina, in the place of W. E. Harrison, whose commission expired April 5, 1898.

John B. Respass, to be postmaster at Washington, in the county of Beaufort and State of North Carolina, in the place of C. W. Tayloe, whose commission expired February 5, 1898.

David W. Gray, to be postmaster at Harrison, in the county of

Hamilton and State of Ohio, in the place of A. H. Frost, whose commission expires July 10, 1898.

George A. Hubbard, to be postmaster at Berea, in the county of Cuyahoga and State of Ohio, in the place of Frank M. Root, whose commission expired May 9, 1898.

John H. Shankland, to be postmaster at Caldwell, in the county of Noble and State of Ohio, in the place of Lebbeus Belford, whose commission expired May 16, 1898.

William McKinley, to be postmaster at Kingfisher, in the county of Kingfisher and Territory of Oklahoma, in the place of C. J. Nesbitt, whose commission expired June 23, 1898.

Elbert W. Hoyt, to be postmaster at Ponca (late New Ponca), in the county of Kay and Territory of Oklahoma, in the place of W. S. Thomas, removed.

Samuel Murphy, to be postmaster at Oklahoma, in the county of Oklahoma and Territory of Oklahoma, in the place of John A. Flattery, removed.

William M. Cochran, to be postmaster at Dubois, in the county of Clearfield and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of W. F. Daley, whose commission expired March 29, 1898.

Edgar J. Graff, to be postmaster at Blairsville, in the county of Indiana and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of R. B. Evans, whose commission expires August 8, 1898.

William D. Hamilton, to be postmaster at Freedom, in the county of Beaver and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after July 1, 1898.

Robert J. Henderson, to be postmaster at Phoenixville, in the county of Chester and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of John Haviland, whose commission expired March 19, 1898.

R. M. Hunt, to be postmaster at Houtzdale, in the county of Clearfield and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Joseph Delehunt, whose commission expired March 5, 1898.

Samuel Keat, to be postmaster at Pen Argyl, in the county of Northampton and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of W. P. Messinger, resigned.

George G. Alexander, to be postmaster at Camden, in the county of Kershaw and State of South Carolina, in the place of C. J. Shannon, whose commission expired May 11, 1898.

Walter L. Darby, to be postmaster at Pomeroy, in the county of Garfield and State of Washington, in the place of J. D. Tyrrel, removed.

D. Jay Olds, to be postmaster at South Bend, in the county of Pacific and State of Washington, in the place of J. J. Brown, whose commission expired April 5, 1898.

Ida A. Hewes, to be postmaster at Casper, in the county of Natrona and State of Wyoming, in the place of M. L. Bishop, removed.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 6, 1898.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

THIRD REGIMENT OF INFANTRY.

To be captains.

Charles K. Maddox, of Georgia.

William Y. Carter, of Georgia.

Jefferson Wilcox, of Georgia.

To be first lieutenants.

Lee C. Hoyl, of Georgia.

Thad H. Parker, of Georgia.

To be second lieutenant.

James H. Blount, jr., of Georgia.

FIFTH REGIMENT OF INFANTRY.

To be assistant surgeon with the rank of first lieutenant.

Charles T. Pollard, of Alabama.

To be chaplain.

Robert D. Wear, of Alabama.

To be captain.

James K. Vardaman, of Mississippi.

To be first lieutenant.

William E. Darby, of Mississippi.

To be second lieutenant.

Samuel K. Mayers, of Mississippi.

POSTMASTERS.

E. W. Scott, to be postmaster at Winchester, in the county of Randolph and State of Indiana.

John A. Spalding, to be postmaster at Nashua, in the county of Hillsboro and State of New Hampshire.

Henry Dryhurst, to be postmaster at Meriden, in the county of New Haven and State of Connecticut.